DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 452 SO 016 143

AUTHOR	Kirk, Mary Ann
TITLE	The Maryland Experience. A Rededication to Traditional American Values.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	77p.; Appendices contain small print that may not reproduce clearly.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; Citizenship Responsibility; Curriculum Development; Democracy; *Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethical Instruction; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; School Community Relationship; Social Studies; *State Programs; Values; *Values Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland

ABSTRACT

The format and mode of operation of a special commission appointed by the Maryland legislature to examine the teaching of values in elementary and secondary public schools are presented. The Commission surveyed and evaluated values education programs, interviewed educators, and held meetings with citizens throughout the state. Consensus was reached regarding specific character and citizenship values that should be taught in the schools and an action plan was written. The Commission completed its work by making 51 recommendations addressed to the governor, legislature, state and local boards, and school district personnel. The report discusses how the project began, the enabling legislation, forms of data gathering, and specific program outcomes. Also discussed are the reasons for the Commission's successes and potential problems that can be avoided by others interested in undertaking a similar state project. Appendices include the Senate Joint Resolution to establish the Commission, project correspondence, and official Commission recommendations. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253452

THE · MARYLAND · EXPERIENCE

A REDEDICATION TO TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Ann Kirk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MARY ANN KIRK

SO 016 143

"During the four years of our deliberations, the Commission members have been constantly reminded, or in some cases, have learned an important and vital lesson. In spite of divergent ethnic and religious backgrounds, differing work experience, and varying political interests, we have, through open and informed discussion, been able to reach strong and clear agreement on a difficult subject of grave concern for all citizens of this country. It is a process which we believe exemplifies the genius and glory of a free democratic system. But this fragile jewel of human civilization must be carefully nurtured by a concerned citizenry that understands and is committed to its maintenance and its basic values."

—Maryland Values Education Commission

THE MARYLAND EXPERIENCE

A Rededication to Traditional American Values

MARY ANN KIRK

Foreward by
THE HONORABLE JENNINGS RANDOLPH
United States Senator from West Virginia

The Citizenship Education Foundation, inc.
14609 CHESTERFIELD ROAD • ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20853

1984 4

THE MARYLAND EXPERIENCE: A REDEDICATION TO TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES. Copyright 1984 by The Citizenship Education Foundation, inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this manuscript may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations. For information write: The Citizenship Education Foundation, Inc., 14609 Chesterfield Road, Rockville, Maryland 20853.

FIRST EDITION

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Kirk, Mary Ann
The Maryland Experience.

Includes bibliographical references

Library of Congress Card Number: 84-70968

This publication was funded by a grant from the U. S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under federal government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Points of view or opinions stated herein do not therefore necessarily represent official Department of Education position or policy.

To all of those
who believe
in the beloved community.

table of contents

I. Acknowledgements 7

II. Foreword by Jennings Randolph, United States Senator from West Virginia 11

III. Introduction 15

IV. The Maryland Experience 21
- Why did the State of Maryland create a Commission to examine the teaching of values in its schools? 22
- Why the Commission format? 22
- Why a Joint Resolution in the State Legislature? 23
- Where did the idea for the Commission begin? 24
- What kind of research was involved? 24
- How did the legislation get passed? 25
- What did the Resolution say? 27
- Did the Governor automatically appoint the Commission based on the Resolution? 27
- How were members of the Commission chosen? 27
- How did the work of the Commission begin? 30
- When did the subcommittee work begin? 32
- Once the framework for study was established, what actions were taken? 34
- What forms did the data gathering take? 35
- How was the work coordinated and liaison established between the Commission and various agencies and school districts? 36
- How was the work of the Commission received? 38
- What recommendations appeared in the final report? 40
- Who received copies of the *Maryland Values Education Commission Report?* 44
- What are the specific outcomes of the Maryland Values Education Commission? 46

V. Reflections 49

VI. Gaining Support for a State Level Values Education Commission Established by the Legislature 53

VII. References 57

VIII. Appendices
- A. Values Education Approaches 61
- B. Enabling Legislation-S.J.R. 64 63
- C. Maryland State Attorney General Opinion on Values Education 66
- D. The Commission's 51 Recommendations 75

acknowledgements

As I prepared this manuscript, I became acutely aware of the words of Olympic Gold Medal runner, Althea Gibson, when she said, "No matter what you accomplish — somebody helps you."

Hundreds! of individuals, some of them representing our most time-honored institutions and organizations, are responsible for "The Maryland Experience."

Among the first to be acknowledged are the Board of Directors of the Religious Heritage of America, especially Wallace Johnson, Co-founder and Vice-Chairman, Holiday Inns, Inc.; W. Clement Stone, Chairman, Combined Insurance Company of America; Robert P. Gerholz, President, Gerholz Enterprises and former President, United States Chamber of Commerce; and Dr. Bob Childers, Executive Director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools,[1] whose leadership created the national REDISCOVER AMERICA program in 1976. It was through that program — dedicated to improving the quality of life in America by reaffirming and applying the principles that made this nation great — and the inspiration and help of fellow board member, Senator Jennings Randolph (D-WVA), that I began the Values Education initiative in Maryland. I am deeply grateful for the Senator's continued support and active presence in the work since that time.

Of course, there would be no "Maryland Experience" to write about without the remarkably effective sponsorship of the legislation (SJR-64) that created the Maryland Values Education Commission. My deep admiration and appreciation go to Senator Lawrence Levitan and Delegate Eugene Zander for applying their energy and political capital toward the successful passage of SJR-64.

I am also indebted to Education Secretary Terrel Bell, then Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah, for his speeches and writings on moral and citizenship education. They formed the basic authority upon which I built "my case" for Values Education in the General Assembly of Maryland.

Dr. Richard Wilson, Director of Social Studies in my home county (Montgomery), has earned a special place "in heaven" for the countless hours spent educating me in the ways to teach values through history. The rationale for Values Education that I developed as a result went a long way toward "allaying the fears" of the legislators.

Other notable contributors from Maryland in those early stages of research and legislative effort were Dr. James Sensenbaugh, former State Superintendent of Schools; Dr. Kenneth Barnes, Education Officer for Acting Governor Blair Lee III; Ann Mathias, Special Assistant to the State Superintendent of Schools; Robert A. Stagmer, Headmaster, Revelation 22 Academy; William Hardy, Executive Director, Maryland Contractors Association; Vincent Gingerich, President, Maryland Bar Association; Thomas Downs, Esq.; Philip Feliciano, Esq.; Janet Ballas, Doris Carter, and Jane Gude. Gilbert Gude, Director of the Office of Congressional Research Services, and former U. S. Congressional Representative from Maryland, will be forever remembered for his late snowy-night delivery to my home of his wife, Jane's, written testimony for presentation the following morning in the Maryland Senate.

Dr. Russell Hill, Director of Moral and Citizenship Education, Research for Better Schools (RBS), Philadelphia, PA, provided strong reinforcement for my legislative efforts by furnishing "state of the art" values education information. He later helped launch national activities in citizenship education, and introduced me to the world of scholarship and program in citizenship education throughout the nation. I will be eternally grateful. During that time, Dr. Russell Farnen, political scientist and Director of the University of Connecticut at Hartford, educated me on the enduring principles of citizenship in a democracy, along with George Lowe, U. S. Department of Education, Dr. Mansfield Smith, and Dr. Franklin Patterson, Boyden Professor of the University of Massachusetts.

Preeminent educator, Dr. Ralph Tyler, introduced me to the concept of "community-involved" education as well as the underlying factors in educator motivation. Somehow, in that punishing, international schedule of his he always found time to meet and advise.

James W. Rouse, the "builder of cities that build the man," provided the example of successful consensus building among "diverse elements" on which the composition of the Commission was based. He was generous with his time and remained a friend of the Commission throughout its work.

Former Minnesota Governor, Albert H. Quie, instructed our work from the very beginning with his advice: "What they (elected leaders) usually need is someone to point out something that is 'anti-citizenship education' and how they could correct it. Or something that is not happening that should be, and how they could help facilitate it."

A special tribute goes to W. Clement Stone and Combined International for their substantial investment of time and funds in The Center for Citizenship Education (CCE), Washington, D. C., which made it possible to catalyze a national movement in citizenship education. Heartfelt thanks also go to the Board of Directors of CCE, and especially Sargent Shriver and Edmund G. Pabst, for their belief in me and generous support of my activities regarding the work of the Maryland Values Education Commission.

I owe a large debt to Dr. Homer Elseroad, former Superintendent of Schools of Montgomery County, MD. He made himself available for continuous dialogue throughout the years of the Commission's work. As educator, mentor, friend, he skillfully guided "my learning" of education structure, school environment, curriculum development, state and local education process as well as the political realities of educational reform.

Dr. Edwin Delattre, President, St. John's College, Annapolis, MD, was the "light at the end of the tunnel" that led to the Commission's decision on "appropriate" curricular

framework. Both he and Dr. James Binko, Dean of the School of Education, Towson State University, Towson, MD, contributed their time, on an ongoing basis, as consultants to the Commission.

It is impossible to list all the names of the hundreds of persons in the schools and school districts who assisted in our data collections. Administrators, teachers, students, parents, and public and private agencies were very cooperative, generously giving many hours of their time. David W. Hornbeck, Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, deserves a special commendation for his gracious accommodation to all Commission requests.

Richard Schifter, Commission Chairman, always made time to meet and advise. In spite of an overwhelming national and international agenda that included responsibilities as U. S. Representative and Chairman of the U. S. Delegation to the United Nations Human Rights Commission, he provided unfailing and continuing leadership over a four-year period of time.

I owe each Commissioner my deep appreciation for his or her cooperation, hard work and devotion to the goals of the Commission. Thanks especially, to Jack Epstein and Charles Obrecht.

Accolades! go to Carol Garey, Commission Secretary, for her dedicated and tireless work — sometimes on weekends and holidays — arranging meetings, typing documents and maintaining "multiple" liaison.

Margaret R. Donley, the State Department of Education's publication specialist, did a tremendous job formatting and publishing the final Commission Report.

Finally, my gratitude to Governor Harry Hughes for his continued support of the Commission's work and its future goals. And, ever, my thanks to Sheila Tolliver, Education Officer for Governor Hughes, for her "open door."

While I have worked these past five years to synthesize the "learning" and the "ideas" contained in this manuscript, it would not have been possible to put them down in coherent fashion without the help of friends and colleagues.

I am indebted to John Pletch Adams for his help in distilling the massive amounts of information. He brought to bear a calm, thoughtful, gifted approach that produced "just the salient facts" out of a lengthy investigative process that went off in many directions. I must also acknowledge the work of Elizabeth Purcell, whose excellent editing and organizational skills helped to integrate the data and make the necessary connections among ideas. Thanks are due also to Gail Monk who worked late hours to search for facts and type the multiple drafts for presentation in "beautiful form." Also, Walter Sorg's critical appraisal was invaluable.

And, lastly, and most importantly, thanks to my husband, William D. Kirk, Jr., for making it possible for me to persevere.

M.A.K.

foreword

JENNINGS RANDOLPH
UNITED STATES SENATE

As I approach nearly forty years of public life, both in the House and Senate of the United States Congress, it is a bit ironic to find myself, at the age of 82 — even in the Orwellian year of 1984 — writing about the need to teach the fundamental values of democracy to our nation's children in the public schools. It used to be that the discipline, respect for authority, social responsibility and shared values that build good character and good citizenship, were learned at home, church and school. It was considered the "norm." Now it appears that teaching the democratic ideals of our Republic is a "new" concept, if not a dangerous one.

I find this way of thinking incredible.

Today America is undergoing some of the most sweeping changes in the entire history of our country. Tiny microchips have sparked a revolution creating an information society out of an industrial one. The "new" technologies have brought space exploration and travel, new generations of computers and the need for new products and greater productivity. Serious moral dilemmas are posed in the areas of social welfare, environmental control, genetic engineering, national defense, etc. America's place in the world has become as big and as great as one's imagination.

The premiere education issue in the 1980s, obviously, is "excellence." At the National Forum on Excellence in Education, Secretary of Education, Terrel Bell, eloquently stated that one dimension of that goal being sought is "to prepare our students for the responsibilities of the high office of private citizen." Our economic health, social well-being, political viability and position of international preeminence flow from a well-educated but *also* well-intentioned citizenry.

Education for our young leaders of tomorrow must necessarily include an emphasis on math, science, high technology, and free enterprise. However, we must not place so much emphasis in these areas that we lose our perspective and neglect such vital disciplines as English, history, government and social studies. We do so at our peril. These are the great reservoirs of America's rich spiritual heritage. From them, our youth must draw strength and inspiration. From them, American children can learn the fundamental values of faith, family, work, community and peace.

Two centuries ago these values led our Founding Fathers to build institutions and begin the United States Constitution with the historic, courageous words: "We the people. . ." Today our democratic institutions and ideals unite all Americans regardless of color or creed. As we educate our youth to make the difficult decisions that lie ahead, there must be in their minds, no confusion or misunderstanding of the imperishable truths, time-tested doctrines and democratic ideals on which our states and nation were founded. This is what Benjamin Franklin meant when he said we had a Republic *if* we could keep it. Our schools must teach youth how to keep our Republic.

As it must be, Education will always be a central issue in our country. That is why I have deliberately and forcefully sought membership on Education committees in both bodies of Congress throughout my service.

During this time, I have found no constituency for low standards, disillusionment or decay. Nor is there an advocacy for chemical abuse, truancy, vandalism, violence and declining test scores. Yet these conditions exist. One of the reasons is that teachers, parents, and school board members are overly cautious in their adherence to the notion that education should not be political. It should!

Education *is* properly political and value-laden. The nation's purpose in educating the young is to fit them for citizenship. Its cultural purpose is *not* to mold them into a single image, but to transmit values which are politically, not scientifically derived.

Teaching traditional American values is, to a large degree, teaching children history — teaching them about the Constitution, how it came about, and how it can be changed (amended), even when it is controversial to make that change. It is teaching how the political system works, and how "we the people's" choices determine the survival of our democratic two-party system — here and abroad in those instances where our Government may try to establish governments with all the inherent rights we enjoy here in America.

Schools need our help. Contemporary society has imposed responsibilities on them that would have confounded our Founding Fathers — responsibilities formerly shared, for the most part, by other institutions. In the past two decades, I have seen our schools become places where many different agendas were worked out — the fight over church-state relations; integration and civil rights; even the consumer movement which forced nutritional reforms in school lunch programs.

These issues have gone a long way toward clarifying many of the values of a democratic society. At the same time, they have cast a tremendous burden on schools. In addition, schools are dealing with moral issues formerly dealt with solely by the home and church. All of this points to the need for "other institutions" to become involved in a coordinated arrangement with the schools to support the total educational experience of youth.

Every society needs a self-renewing system or framework to accommodate change and nurture RENAISSANCE. It is now time to look carefully at our existing system of Education, and in the spirit of a Constitutional "amendment," take action to create the new structures and policies — possibly even new laws — that lend themselves to that RENAISSANCE.

The Maryland Experience is an excellent example of how that might work. In 1978, the State of Maryland decided to stop the hand wringing and finger pointing concerning the problems of children who have not been taught character and citizenship values and *do* something to correct an undesirable, unacceptable situation. In that spirit, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation establishing the first Values Education Commission in America. For four years this Commission worked to produce a *process* whereby local communities

defined themselves by identifying character and citizenship values and objectives the overwhelming majority of people supported and endorsed. Amazingly, all 24 school districts in Maryland adopted these values through school board action.

The consequent values and objectives cited in the Commission Report are important. But it is the *process* which must be preserved and disseminated nationwide. That is the purpose of documenting that process, *The Maryland Experience*, in this book which takes its readers step by step through the initiation of the enabling legislation to the writing of the final report.

During the 97th Congress (1982), I was able to guide to enactment an authorization (Public Law 97-313) that permits states to allocate a portion of their Chapter Two Block Grants to fund citizenship education programs in public and private schools. I understand that since that time, Secretary Bell has proposed a 52 percent increase in these funds in his Fiscal 1985 Budget. I regret to say, few people seem to be aware that the opportunity is available for this purpose, and to my knowledge no school or school district has applied to a state for Chapter Two funds to establish and teach citizenship education classes. This inaction makes me realize anew that it is not enough to provide opportunity only to our citizens — we must also take measures to strengthen resolve. For example:

In 1942, as a member of the House of Representatives, I offered a Constitutional amendment which would permit 18, 19 and 20-year-old youths to cast their ballots in the elections of this country. We were at war and these young people were moving into the battle lines at 18 years of age. I thought then that they were entitled to participate actively in the process of decision-making in this country. At that time, only one state, Georgia, granted the right to vote to its youth under 21.

The amendment failed. I was perhaps downcast, but I realized that you do not always succeed at the beginning.

Year after year, Congress after Congress, I introduced our Constitutional Amendment to provide not only the opportunity to vote, but, more importantly, to charge young people with the responsibility to use the ballot in all elections. It was not until March 23, 1971, that the amendment passed both the House and the Senate. I knew its time had come! In 90 days, the shortest period of time ever used by the states for ratification, a Constitutional amendment came into being.

In 1980, only 22 percent of those 18, 19 and 20-year-olds voted for a President of the United States. In one state, the percentage hovered around 16 percent, a staggeringly low figure. Tragically, in state after state, overall voter participation was less than one-half of its registered voters. (West Virginia was not one of those states — we had 71 percent!)

Both youth and adults have asked me: "What difference does it make if I vote?" — "What can *one* person do?"

My answer is always the same: "Either you use the ballot, or you lose it!"

The Maryland Experience proves that "one vote" does make a difference. Mary Ann Kirk initiated action in her state that not only created the Maryland Values Education Commission but catalyzed a national movement in citizenship education. I am grateful to have shared in those efforts.

208 years ago 56 men signed the Declaration of Independence. The signers were men in the best sense of the word — men of wealth, of moral substance, of determination, of spirit. Yet

they risked their lives and all they possessed as they began to tell the story of freedom to the world. Most were subsequent victims of reprisals by the British, left penniless, imprisoned and broken in health — but *never in spirit*.

Yes, it was 208 years ago that these signers affixed their signatures, one of them saying, because he had palsy and wanted to explain his shaking hand, "my hand trembles but my heart does not."

And today, what of our hearts? What of our hands?

Will we, through education, take the necessary action to lift the spirit of our youth in the principles of citizenship? Will we strengthen their vision, deepen their dedication and make them worthy decendents of those valiant men? Will we prepare American youth to *again* prove that the United States is a shining example of men and women working at the job of democracy? Will we teach tomorrow's leaders to talk together and work together, expressing diverse opinions without becoming divisive?

The members of the legislature of the State of Maryland passed significant legislation having to do with a study commission. It's final report signified that in every area of our country — within each state, county and community — there are historic values that can be brought to the attention of our youth. We are a diverse people, but, as Americans, we are joined together by the knowledge that the desire for freedom brought our country into existence.

The State of Maryland is the first to create a Values Education Commission. The flame of faith is now aglow in "The Free State." May other states see the light and feel its warmth.

introduction

"The mixed blessings of industrial revolution, urbanization, technological advances — and all their accompaniments — have led to the highly complex and fragmented social structure we now live in. . . . School is perhaps the sole common denominator of children past infancy. . . . Our task here, then, is to consider ways of deliberately, systematically, and effectively carrying out moral education in the schools — and to do this in a way that violates none of the ethnic, racial, or religious differences that characterize our country's children."

—Terrel H. Bell, Commmissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah, 1976[1]

We must find ways to teach historic democratic values to young people in public schools. There is a way — *The Maryland Experience.*

Many people believe that American ideals increasingly fail to find expression in the lives of our youth. Our leaders have "failed us" and the institutions we depended on to teach democratic values have "let us down."

Something has gone tragically wrong with our society in recent years. Statistics illustrate this depressing truth. Last year, according to the Justice Department, almost one-third of all families in the United States were touched by crime. More than 23,000 Americans were murdered in 1983. Crime and delinquency cost us at least 125 billion dollars each year.

Truancy is epidemic. For example, in Maryland it can be expected that 63,000 students will not be in school on any given day. Drug and alcohol abuse, violence, ethnic hatred, destruction of property and the absence of discipline are commonplace in many schools. More than 130,000 teachers are assaulted each year by students. (These are the reported incidents. School officials will tell you that many more cases go unreported.)

Home and church once provided the permanency and stability upon which schools could build an ethical education. These institutions have been seriously weakened in recent years. Church attendance has dropped. One-fifth of all Americans change their addresses every year. This mobility begs for something to replace what once was taken for granted — the community.

"We are being cut adrift from the type of humanizing authority which in the past shaped the character of our people," says Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell, Jr. "The more personal forms we have known in the home, church, school and community, which once gave direction to our lives, are disappearing."

Today the divorce rate is near 50 percent and the number of single parent families is at an all time high. Fewer than half of all teenagers live with their natural parents. Almost 45 percent of children born today can expect to be living with only one parent before they reach 18 years of age. The current syndrome of rapid change, rapid obsolescence and repeated dislocation has taken a heavy toll on our young. Suicide is now the number two cause of teenage death.

More than half of all mothers with school age children now work. Parents spend less time with their children than did previous generations. For many of today's children, home means little more than a bed and a TV set. Studies show that young people identify more with their favorite TV character than with their own parents.

Television is so pervasive that it may be the single most important factor in conditioning children in our society. Today the average child has watched 4,000 hours of television before entering first grade. The average youngster between kindergarten and graduation from high school has watched 15,000 hours of television while spending only 12,000 hours in the classroom. By age 14, the average child has witnessed the destruction of more than 12,000 people on television.

Our young people reflect the unfortunate results of all these negative trends through their failure to set high standards for themselves and by their growing cynicism toward this nation's leadership and democratic institutions. A recent Gallup Poll revealed a distrust among young people of business, industry, government and institutions in general. Some 63 percent between 18 and 24 indicated that they have "very little" confidence in Congress and 56 percent said they have "very little" confidence in business.

This disaffection manifests itself in an attitude among young people that they are powerless to change their conditions and so it doesn't matter if they participate in the democratic processes such as voting. In 1980, less that 22 percent of the 18 to 20 year old population voted compared to 55 percent of the total population.

According to the 13th Gallup Poll on the public's attitudes toward public schools, "discipline" was identified as the greatest concern of all parents. That same poll revealed that 70 percent of Americans favored instruction in values and ethical behavior in the schools. Many of the social problems that threaten the existence of our society — corruption, rising rates of juvenile delinquency and crime, domestic instability and violence — are blamed on the lack of values education.

From the foregoing, one might conclude that there would be no trouble selling the concept of values education in our public schools. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Though the nation was founded on a clearly defined set of beliefs, and though traditional values were assumed to be part of the school curriculum, teaching values in public schools today is very controversial!

"From the very start, our society has been deeply concerned with teaching ethics and values," says Education Secretary, Terrel Bell. "In earlier and simpler times, the schools accomplished this task through a loose, informal but intimate confederation with home and church...Moral education became an implicit responsibility of the child's most immediate environment."

Dr. John Silber, President of Boston University, feels that earlier generations were convinced that "to introduce moral and spiritual content into the education of the child simply expressed a concern to educate children in the full dimension of reality, to prepare them in short for full, true human experience.

"It was not enough to merely talk about mathematics and arithmetic; it was not good enough to teach writing as a simple form of expression or penmanship as a form of beautiful writing. There was essential content in the curriculum and that content was a distillation of a very high culture."

When did our schools begin to change? The change coincided with a combination of civil rights and women's movements plus a series of court decisions that have repeatedly ruled against any sort of activity that could in any was be associated with religion. Consequently, schools began to change the content of their courses. Many changes were long overdue. Textbooks of the last century often promoted damaging racial and sexual stereotypes. History was often distorted and made simplistic. Most of the harmful material has been revised, but in the purging process, the moral and ethical content has also been removed. As one Maryland educator noted, "we have textbooks of nothingness."

The transition has taken place essentially from the Eisenhower years through the present time. Our world has changed dramatically since the end of World War II, to the time of our involvement in Vietnam and Watergate, down to the present. We have seen a profound alteration in our perception of ourselves as a people, of the United States as a nation, of the individual as a citizen.

But the basic values of democracy have not altered with time. It is only the context in which these principles and values are applied which has changed to meet the challenges of each generation.

The challenges today take on increasing international dimension as well as domestic ones. America is being called upon to make choices that seriously affect the very existence of our freedom. And yet, as a people, we conspicuously lack agreement on "principle" — those values that must direct our decisionmaking and determine our place in this global village that is now our world.

The questions already lie exposed before us:

- ○ How to maintain the balance of world powers without sacrificing principle *or* national safety?
- ○ How to adjust a heavy-industry economy down to the size of a microchip?
- ○ How to preserve our environment in the face of human and national need?
- ○ How to feed the hungry, to house the poor, to care for the sick, to educate the ignorant?
- ○ How to reconcile majority rule with minority rights, individualism with democracy, higher law with popular sovereignty?
- ○ How to deal with crime and the destructive influences that surround our youth?
- ○ How to create an art of human values in a world of mass culture?

And the most challenging of all questions, as posed by The Atlantic Council of the United States:
"How do we resolve the moral dilemma of profound horror at the possibility of nuclear war on the one hand, and the obligation on the other, to maintain and transmit to the future, the heritage of Freedom?"

Without the critical thinking skills and moral values that will allow today's students to determine right from wrong, justice from injustice, morality from expediency, truth from fallacy, acceptance from bigotry, fair play from seizing any advantage, freedom from tyranny, they cannot address these pressing issues. They will be unable to assume their leadership roles tomorrow — when our country will be looking to them for guidance.

The Atlantic Council elaborates further: "The need for sound discrimination among competing and contrasting value systems has accelerated with our transition into the age of technological prowess, global interdependence, nuclear power and space travel.

"Never in the history of humankind have Alfred North Whitehead's words been more pertinent: 'The future is big with every possibility of achievement and tragedy.'

"Whether it is achievement or tragedy the successor generation will experience depends very much on what values they choose to work, suffer, live, pay and die for."

A thorough understanding of these values, their origins and their earlier applications is essential to assist our youth in clarifying "principles" in present circumstances and freshly examining their application in a society undergoing rapid change.

There is no absence of scholarship, program or dedicated individuals to prepare our youth for the hard choices that lie ahead. What *is* missing is the educational *policy* to direct this focus in our schools. This will occur once a community defines a set of beliefs commonly held in democratic, pluralistic societies and takes the necessary "political" action to create appropriate policy.

Maryland's rededication to traditional American values began in 1978 at the grassroots with concerned citizens. We recognized a problem and sought the solution through citizen activity that involved our state and local elected officials. There were no federal funds involved. We set a single goal: find ways in which the historic values of this nation can be taught to our young people in the public schools of Maryland.

What emerged, after four years of grassroots study, was a view of a profoundly changed society and a complex array of educating institutions and agencies that have direct bearing on the transmission of democratic principles to our youth. This, in turn, revealed a need for new structures and new policies within the schools to accommodate the involvement of these institutions and agencies, and new "avenues" to bring about a self-consciousness on the part of each as to their particular function in the "whole" of the education process.

These views are reflected in the Commission's recommendations for state and local task forces to act as coordinating mechanisms to maximize the educational resources of the entire community. John Goodlad, in his recent national report, *A Place Called School*, articulates it this way:

> "Different kinds of institutions which educate or might educate exist in various relationships to each other. That is, an educational ecosystem exists. It may be in good, fair, or poor health. The first step toward healthier functioning is to bring the existence of this ecosystem to a level of consciousness. The second is to seek

the best possible understanding of its nature. The third is to formulate policies, develop plans, and execute these plans for purposes of increasing the effectiveness of the ecosystem."

Local school-based mechanisms that form a coalition of educating agencies such as home, school, church, business, industry, television, government, cultural resources, etc., provide excellent forums to build community awareness of the need to address the issue as well as a sense of citizen and other-agency responsibility. They also offer opportunity for translating the resulting "awareness" into more enlightened policies within each agency to enhance values education. In addition, they can provide the coordinating procedures that are necessary to match community resources to the specific needs of the schools.

Such forums are in a position to influence local community policy and affect state agendas for policy development.

A state coordinating agency can be effective to encourage cooperation of the local entity in the coordination process and provide needed interface with higher education. Similarly, the state agenda will influence the federal agenda for policy development.

Along with the majority of Americans, the Commission drew its attention to discipline and disruptive behavior problems:

> "Values cannot be successfully taught in a setting in which acts in violation of the very principles that are being taught are committed frequently and are totally ignored by persons in authority. Disruptive activity and disorder are violations of the rights of students by their fellow students. If young people are to be taught that society demands of its members respect for the rights of their neighbors, this must be vividly illustrated in the school setting. This means that efforts must be made to stop, and where appropriate, penalize acts of disruption and violations of laws and rules."

In order to take the measures that are required in such instances, the Commission determined that schools must have discipline policies, supported by the parents and reinforced by local school board action. The school boards need to provide inservice for teachers and legal protection for reasonable acts in this regard.

All in all, the Commission made 51 recommendations with regard to teaching traditional American values in the public schools. They focus on the key leadership ability of the school principal, efficacy of the teacher, school counseling, a "working" configuration of school and other-agency cooperation, parent involvement, a curricular framework, service learning opportunities for our youth and a call to leadership at all the highest levels to address the topic in direct fashion.

Recently issued national reports such as *A Nation at Risk, High School, A Place Called School, The Paideia Proposal, Educating Americans for the 21st Century, Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools, Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma Of The American High School*, etc.,[2] echo the themes that appear in the *Maryland Values Education Commission Report*. They all place American public schools "at the crossroads" where decisions must be made to direct the student toward excellence, productivity and high standards of deportment and citizen participation.

Our quantum leap toward the 21st century has created expectations from our schools far beyond what they can achieve alone. Today, they stand in the "center" of a new configuration of educating agencies — without the *premise* of education clarified, absent of necessary structure, and without adequate policy to do the job that must be done.

What can we do? We can create and nurture "neutral zones" — commissions of reconcilliation — where institutions and agencies within the community can come together to talk about the fundamental *premise* of education, achieve consensus on basic principles and assume responsibility for initiating actions that result in the achieved objective.

The Maryland Experience is that process. Unlike hypothetical theory and the "we need" philosophy found in the recent array of national reports, *The Maryland Experience* is a blueprint for action. It has been developed, tried, and found to deliver positive results. It answers the negative thinking that says "teaching values education" can't be done ins a society of diverse ethnic, racial, religious make-up.

The primary thrust of the Maryland Values Education Commission has been to affirm the right and the obligation to teach democratic values in American schools. It has laid a foundation for action. Right now, Dr. Robert Y. Dubel, Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore County, MD, is leading a comprehensive values education initiative throughout his entire school district. He has unified the diverse elements of his community around a plan to translate 20 clearly defined democratic values into structure, policy, and concrete program. He created his "neutral zone" with the formation of The Task Force on Values Education and Ethical Behavior of the Baltimore County Public Schools.

We have raised community awareness of the need to teach traditional American values in our schools. It is our hope that increased understanding of our schools and renewed sensitivity to their needs by all citizens will follow. American institutions respond to the will of the people. As mature citizens, we must study the nature of the institution and the role we as citizens can take to make it more responsive to the educational needs of our young. When these things begin to happen, we will see laws and policies to reverse negative and disruptive behavior in our schools. The restoration of a focus on democratic values in our schools and communities will strengthen the family and encourage participation by citizens and cooperation among institutions.

To put it simply, we expect to see ordinary citizens bringing about extraordinary change.

"The Commission calls on citizens to hold elected officials responsible for establishing the reforms and restoring quality throughout our educational system. School board members, principals and superintendents, governors and legislators should incorporate the reforms in their educational policies and fiscal planning."

—The White House
Office of the Press Secretary
A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, April 1983.

the Maryland experience:
a rededication to traditional American values.

"Since World War II . . . we've seen the greatest disintegration of the social consensus and the most accelerated pace and degree of change in human history. As a result, all our institutions have lost a coherent set of values . . . Now there is what educators call a 'felt need' to reaffirm them . . . A more likely approach is to take some traditional American virtues and reaffirm them. Our society still has a basic consensus on the values of democracy . . . If we could reaffirm these, we would have a major system of values."

—Steven Muller, President
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD[1]

The Maryland Experience is a splendid example of a state legislative undertaking that served to unite diverse thinking on a controversial issue of national importance. It produced excellent results for Maryland — heightened awareness and debate on a critical issue, values consensus by local school boards, a district-wide values education initiative led by a local school superintendent, etc. But, its great achievement for the nation is the development of a PROCESS for reaching agreement on potentially controversial concepts — traditional American values. This overarching set of beliefs which, ideally, guides our actions, is the premise of education in a democratic society.

"Our purpose for schools — education of the intellect — is obvious. The other — an education in character — is inescapable."[2]

What follows describes the format and mode of operation of the Maryland Values Education Commission. It also presents an insider's look

at the reasons for the Commission's successes and the potential problems and pitfalls which can be avoided or overcome by others interested in charting a similar course in their states. I have chosen a question and answer format to provide ease in reading and to highlight specific areas of interest for individual readers.

Why did the State of Maryland create a *commission* to examine the teaching of values in its schools?

The twenty-four member Commission was created in response to a growing belief that a lack of honesty and integrity among its citizens was directly related to the failure of our institutions to effectively transmit the values contained in our cultural heritage. The task of the Commission was to examine the teaching of values in the elementary and secondary public schools and make recommendations on its findings. The resulting work plan made it possible to:

- Achieve a consensus on shared universal values.
- Involve diverse segments of society in the process.
- Create an understanding of the societal problems that impact on the teaching of values.
- Identify actions and policies which undermine values education, such as absence of discipline policies, truancy laws, lack of interagency cooperation, lack of leadership training for school principals, poor inservice training for teachers, weak liberal arts programs in teacher colleges, insufficient training dealing with disciplinary problems and a lack of community service-learning opportunities for our young.
- Identify action steps ordinary citizens can take to bring about values emphasis.
- Encourage dialogue and remove fear of teaching values.

Why the commission format?

A commission provides an official body which is capable of indepth study of a problem. Such study is necessary before any recommendations can be made. The Commission format has other significant advantages:

- A commission is a study group and avoids any appearance of infringing on the autonomy of the state school system and local

school boards. In Maryland, as in most states, local autonomy is a sensitive political issue.

- A broad based commission ensures representation of diverse segments of the state and advocacy of different points of view on the commission itself. The Joint Resolution calling for the Commission specified the various groups and areas from which the Commission members should be drawn. This broad representation minimizes criticism that any findings and recommendations made by the Commission were unduly influenced by special interest groups.
- A commission allows for the consensus building process in a controversial area like values education. It is essential to create a premise on which to base findings and ultimate recommendations.
- The use of a commission which makes a report to the Governor containing recommendations gives local authorities the option to adopt these findings and recommendations at their discretion while preserving their autonomy.
- The Commission format provides official status for Commission members.
- The formal structure encourages cooperation from state and local education authorities and makes possible cooperation and contribution of in-kind services by state agencies.
- It opens up formal state networks for information gathering and dissemination.
- A governor-appointed commission draws media attention to the issue and thereby heightens public awareness which is essential for educating and involving the citizenry at large.

Why a Joint Resolution in the state legislature?

Use of a Joint Resolution creates a first step and officially establishes an agenda for discussion of values education. It also recognizes certain realities that are probably true in many states:

- An awareness of need for a state authority and a willingness to look into an issue not currently discussed had to be created. In the case of Maryland, a Joint Resolution was recommended instead of a law because of the strong autonomy of the state and local school system. Going for a mandate assures defeat of any effort in values education. The education lobby is very strong.
- State education policy was already set and did not specifically name values education as a priority.

"The time has come for states to recognize that their overriding responsibility is to establish general standards and to provide support, but not to meddle."[3]

- Values education was held in ill regard because of the failure of various strategies that had been ill-employed in some school districts, i.e., values clarification, Kohlberg's theory of moral development. (See Appendix A.)
- Legislators needed an avenue to show their interest in the issue without endorsing any controversial specific approach.

Where did the idea for the commission begin?

The idea for the Maryland Values Education Commission grew out of a program of the Rediscover America National Council. This national organization is dedicated to "improving the quality of American life by reaffirming those principles that made it great." These principles are those that can be found in the great documents of human liberties that shaped the nature and direction of America — the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Rediscover America was concerned that some of these principles were forgotten, distorted or not applied at all in our rapidly changing society, and that many of our major problems as a nation and a people are closely related to this fact.

Rediscover America's fifteen-year program was formally announced on October 2, 1976, looking to culminate on the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America in 1992. It divided its program into segments spanning the fifteen-year period, each segment devoted to different goals or sets of principles. The first principle or theme adopted was: REDISCOVER AMERICA WITH HONESTY, INTEGRITY AND REDUCTION OF CRIME.

Inevitably, the Board — which in addition to myself, included national leaders in business, education, religion and concerned citizens — began discussing the possibility of promoting these values through schools. I felt deeply then, as I do now, that we must place emphasis on American ideals in our schools.

I stated my position so strongly that the Board appointed me a committee of one to research the matter and see if I could establish a model in my home state of Maryland.

What kind of research was involved?

I began by contacting an expert on Constitutional law to confirm that there were no legal impediments to teaching democratic values in the public schools. With the confirmation in hand, I spent the next several

months writing and meeting with elected officials, educators and professional people in Maryland. These included members of the United States Congress, the Governor's Education Officer, former state and local superintendents of schools, a private school headmaster, State Department of Education staff and department heads from my local school district's central office. My question to all: "How can we get values education back in the schools?"

The answer appeared to reside in the Maryland Legislature.

How did the Legislation get passed?

The first thing I did was call on my elected representatives in the Maryland General Assembly, Senator Lawrence Levitan and Delegate Eugene Zander, both of Montgomery County. They became my staunchest allies and introduced a Joint Resolution creating a special commission to deal with values in the schools.

Both men advised me of a political reality — resolutions are easier to pass than laws because they set forth the thinking and wishes of the state legislature, without carrying the force of law. "A resolution allows a politician to take a position without having to take a stand," was the way it was explained to me by one who knows his way around state politics.

Once the Resolution was introduced, the next job was to get it passed. Thomas Downs, a veteran Maryland lobbyist, taught me the rudiments of lobbying and allowed me the use of his office and staff to help with my printing needs. That first day, he instructed me to: "Make lots of copies of the legislation. Next, staple your card to each bill. Now, sit down and write a short paragraph explaining what the bill is all about." When I finished that, the next instruction was to "corner any legislator you can serving on the committees to which the bill has been assigned. Hand them a copy of the legislation and the short paragraph, and ask them to consider voting for it." He gave me a copy of the Maryland Manual with pictures of every Senator and Delegate in it so I could learn who they were and on which committees they served. I was on my way!

The next few months proved to be a lesson in practical civics. My first surprise was to learn how much hot debate and controversy my seemingly benign idea generated. At first, the major objection was that to teach values violated the Constitutional separation of church and state. We began developing materials to prove that this was not the case; that there are certain bedrock ethical points that all people believe in and that there are practical ways to teach them in the context of the current school program without impinging on anyone's religious freedom.

Repeatedly, I argued that the concepts of honesty and ethics can be taught through the social studies curriculum by using the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and other great American documents as

"When we consider basic cultural values, it is important to recognize that the question of whose values is not really relevant. They are all of ours, the values — or ideals — of the many, many elements of our pluralistic society."[4]

vehicles for discussion and exploration. The lives of the Founding Fathers and other great Americans — both living and dead — can also be examined for the ways in which they reflect universally held values.

The going was tough at times. I spent countless hours in the halls of the legislature in Annapolis talking to Senators and Delegates, winning them over one at a time. When the resolution came up before the various committees, I stationed myself up front in the hearing room where I was highly visible and where I could look directly into their faces. If they expressed concern or appeared to hedge on a "yes" vote, I buttonholed them afterwards and asked: "Are you having a problem with this? I would like to help with additional information." When they raised an objection, I answered and tried to win them back over to our side.

Opponents that testified before the General Assembly centered their objections around the danger of certain teaching strategies that they associated with the teaching of values. These dealt, for the most part, with moral relativism and the invasion of privacy. (Descriptions of various strategies appear in Appendix A.) Other testimony argued that "teaching values" is too broad and too vague a term to expect schools to implement — that the United States has institutions such as the courts and the legislatures that are specifically created to reflect a "codification of the nation's values."

The first time the Resolution came up for a vote in the House Ways and Means Committee, it was defeated. However, since the Resolution had received a "good report" in the Senate Finance Committee, the decision was made to let the Senate bill "fly" and to work hard for Ways and Means Committee approval when it went back to that Committee for ratification. Day after day of lobbying and attending committee hearings and floor debates resulted in the "good report" out of the Ways and Means Committee. The Resolution then went to the floor of the House of Delegates where Amendments were offered that required going back to the Senate for ratification.

The next time it came up for a vote in the House, Senators and Delegates were bombarded with phone calls asking them to vote *against* the Resolution. One group told the Speaker of the House that "we can't live with this bill!"

"What should I do now?," I asked John Hanson Briscoe, Speaker of the House. "Get down on the floor and lobby for every vote you can get!" was his reply. I did just that.

When the Resolution reached the floor of the House for a vote, another Amendment was offered which would have prevented its passage since there would not be time to complete the legislative process before the end of the Session. The Amendment was defeated. Finally, on the last day of the Session, April 10, 1978, shortly before midnight, Senate Joint Resolution 64 establishing the Maryland Values Education Commission was passed. It was the culmination of a lot of diligent effort by Senator Levitan, Delegate Zander and myself.

What did the Resolution say?

In part, the Resolution states: "There are large numbers of parents and educators who feel deeply that today's society, and particularly our schools, must address this void.

"The early school years are especially important because a critical stage of development is beginning — that of thinking in the abstract, making judgments that will form the basis of character for the years to come.

"But the concerns must be carried through to middle school, high school and college and into personal and public life. The intermediate years are times of experimentation and value assessment, the upper years are periods of judgment and value testing." (The full Resolution appears in Appendix B.)

"In the future, citizenship responsibility will be more, not less demanding; economic pressures will be more, not less, intense. Opportunities for human progress, as well as threats to our quality of life, will increase. The bidding has gone up and the quality of our schools must go up as well. We cannot rest with what we have today."[5]

Did the Governor automatically appoint the Commission based on the Resolution?

No. The Resolution *requested* the Governor to appoint the Commission. Getting it appointed required a whole new lobbying effort. Also, since the provisions of the Resolution carried no fiscal impact on State revenues, the Department of Fiscal Services advised the Governor that any expenses of the Commission could be absorbed in the Governor's Survey-Commissions Appropriation without increase. Acting Governor, Blair Lee III, appointed the Commission on his last day before leaving office, January 5, 1979, and the new incoming Governor, Harry Hughes, directed the Maryland State Department of Education to absorb the Commission's expenses.

How were members of the Commission chosen?

Once the legislation calling for the creation of the Maryland Values Education Commission was passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor, the process of selecting Commission members began. The legislation was designed to ensure a wide variety of viewpoints on the Commission and specified that:

"The Commission should be balanced on the state and local levels and composed of representatives from the following: State Department of Education, State Government, State School Board, local

school board, state Association of PTAs, curriculum specialists, school teachers, school principals, clergy (Judeo-Christian sector), youth, school counselors, Chamber of Commerce, Department of Labor and Industrial Development, media, sports, service organizations and the public at large."

Leaders and representatives from all areas were actively sought as Commission members. Nominations were made by initiators of the legislation, the Governor's office and State Board of Education. Some people, who had learned about the Commission through the media, contacted the Governor's office with requests to serve.

The nominees were contacted by the Governor's Appointments Officer and those chosen were appointed by the Governor. Seven members of the Commission were unable to serve their full terms. These members were replaced with individuals who expressed a desire to become involved in the work of the Commission. An orientation committee was formed to familiarize new members with the ongoing work of the Commission.

The overall membership of the Commmision came to include representatives of many diverse sectors:

RICHARD SCHIFTER, Chairman
Attorney, former President of Maryland State Board of Education and currently U. S. Representative and Chairman of the U. S. Delegation to the United Nations Human Rights Commission

MARY ANN KIRK, Vice Chairwoman
Initiator of Senate Joint Resolution No. 64 and President, Center for Citizenship Education, Washington, D. C.

JoANN T. BELL
President, Prince Georges County Board of Education

ALFRED E. BURK*
Vice President, WBAL Radio, Baltimore, Maryland

ERIC L. BYRD
Director, R.E.A.C.H. Office, Dundalk Community College

ROBERT COOK
Director, The Greater Salisbury Committee, Salisbury, Maryland

JACK EPSTEIN
Professor Emeritus and Visiting Professor of Education, Towson State University and Johns Hopkins University

RABBI SEYMOUR ESSROG
Rabbi, Beth Israel Congregation, Randallstown, Maryland

REV. DR. WALTER P. FOGARTY
Co-Pastor of the Evangelical Luteran Church, Frederick, Maryland

RITA S. GORDON
Registered nurse and member of the Frederick County Board of Education

MELINDA GREEN*
Baltimore City high school student

DR. IRVIN HAMER, JR.
Headmaster, Park Heights Street Academy, Baltimore, Maryland

RON HEAD*
Football coach, Towson State University

JOAN H. HODOUS*
Former teacher and Chairperson, Harford County Commission for Women

DR. DELORES KELLEY
Dean, Lower Division, Coppin State College, Baltimore, Maryland

DR. JEAN E. KIRKPATRICK*
Thomas and Dorothy Leavey University Professor of the Foundations at Georgetown University and resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, currently U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations

CLARKE LANGRALL
Insurance executive and President, Clarke Langrall, Inc., Towson, Maryland

DR. ERNEST W. LEFEVER
President, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, D. C.

DR. PAUL J. MASON, ESQ.
Attorney, historian and President, Washington Hebrew Congregation

ADRIAN McCARDELL*
Banking executive and Trustee, Council on Economic Education in Maryland

A. J. McGANN
Executive, C & P Telephone Company, Baltimore, Maryland

KRIS McGOUGH
Parent Activist, Howard County, Maryland

STEPHEN W. McNIERNEY*
Vice President, Business Analysis, Black and Decker Manufacturing Company, Towson, Maryland

E. T. MYERS
Retired elementary school principal and elementary and middle school supervisor, Cambridge, Maryland

CHARLES OBRECHT
Partner, P. F. Obrecht and Sons, Baltimore, Maryland

DR. TONI PARKER
Director, Parent-School Partnership Project, The Home and School Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., former teacher, Montgomery County, Maryland

KITTY SHOAP
Past President of the Maryland Congress of PTAs and former Judge of the Orphans Court in Prince George's County, Maryland

SHEILA TOLLIVER*
Education Officer, Governor's Office, State of Maryland

DR. PERCY WILLIAMS
Maryland State Department of Education

RABBI MITCHELL WOHLBERG*
Rabbi, Beth Tfiloh Congregation, Baltimore, Maryland

HON. EUGENE J. ZANDER
Former member, Maryland House of Delegates; cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution No. 64 establishing the Maryland Values Education Commission, Montgomery County, Maryland

*Incomplete term

How did the work of the Commission begin?

Prior to the first meeting on February 26, 1979, the Chairman worked out a cooperative arrangement with the State Superintendent of Schools to provide space for meetings and staff assistance. In addition to a part-time secretary, a special assistant to the State Superintendent was appointed to work with the Commission as liaison with state agencies and school personnel. Regular meetings were scheduled for the last Monday of the month from 9:30 to 11:30 A.M. in the Board Room at the State Department of Education in Baltimore. A decision was made to tape Commission meetings so that significant points could be accurately recalled at a later time.

At the outset of the Commission's work, following a brief orientation on relevant state and Supreme Court decisions and "state of the art" values education, the Chairman urged members to make statements on their particular philosophy concerning the teaching of traditional American values. This was the beginning of the consensus process within the Commission.

Quite early in the deliberations, the Chairman requested a legal opinion from the State Attorney General to determine the legally permissible scope of values education in the public schools. The opinion, concluding that the schools are free to take an affirmative position on values education without violating the United States Constitution or that of Maryland, was rendered on July 19, 1979. (The full opinion appears in Appendix C.)

The Commission proceeded to define its own mission more clearly than had been possible in the General Assembly Resolution. In doing so, it sought to define the character and citizenship values which the great

majority of the citizens of Maryland wanted to see fostered in the public schools. On July 30, 1979, the Commission adopted a Statement of Purpose, setting forth eighteen character and citizenship goals as follows:

"...One approach is to define a set of beliefs we hold in common in democratic and pluralistic societies. In the United States they form the basis of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution."[6]

CHARACTER OBJECTIVES

- Personal integrity and honesty rooted in respect for the truth, intellectual curiosity, and love of learning.
- A sense of duty to self, family, school and community.
- Self-esteem rooted in the recognition of one's potential.
- Respect for the rights of all persons regardless of their race, religion, sex, age, physical condition, or mental state.
- A recognition of the right of others to hold and express differing views, combined with the capacity to make discriminating judgments among competing opinions.
- A sense of justice, rectitude, fair play or a commitment to them.
- A disposition of understanding, sympathy, concern, and compassion for others.
- A sense of discipline and pride in one's work; respect for the achievements of others.
- Respect for one's property and the property of others, including public property.
- Courage to express one's convictions.

CITIZENSHIP OBJECTIVES

"...Students want and need to know where educated people stand, not on passing issues but on matters of enduring importance, matters that have always been the concern of the humanities: courage, fidelity, friendship, honor, love, justice, goodness, ambiguity, time, power, faith."[7]

- Patriotism: love, respect, and loyalty to the United States of America, the willingness to correct its imperfections by legal means.
- An understanding of the rights and obligations of a citizen in a democratic society.
- An understanding of other societies in the world which do not enjoy the rights and privileges of a democratic government.
- Respect for the U. S. Constitution, the rule of law, and the right of every citizen to enjoy equality under the law. An understanding of the Bill of Rights and a recognition that all rights are limited by other rights and obligations.
- Respect for legitimate authority at the local, state and federal level.
- Allegiance to the concept of democratic government as opposed to totalitarian rule. A recognition that such government is limited by the separation of powers and by the countervailing role of other institutions in a pluralistic society — principally the family, religion, the school, and the private sector of the economy.

- Recognition of the need for an independent court system to protect the rights of all citizens.
- An acceptance of all citizenship responsibilities at the local, state and national levels, and a commitment to preserve and defend the United States and its democratic institutions.

Having established the two broad categories of character and citizenship values, the Commission decided to concentrate in the first instance on character goals and to defer consideration of citizenship goals, which it considered closely related to the social studies program. Later, the two categories were addressed as one.

When did the Subcommittee work begin?

After the first meeting, the Commission immediately began to structure the State for study. Maryland's 24 school districts were divided into six regions and subcommittee chairmen were appointed to study four school districts each. They organized meetings between Commission members and local education agencies including superintendents, central office staff members, parents, teachers, counselors and students. The purpose was to orient the individual subdivisions to the Commission's objectives and to obtain advice on how best to proceed with its task. Later, the Commissioners split up into smaller subgroups to carry out field investigations. A questionnaire was designed to determine what was "pro-values," what was "anti-values," and what required change. It also assured some consistency in how information was gathered.

Following these field visits, a comprehensive statement on specific topics to be addressed in the final Commission report was adopted. (Role of: Principals, Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Parents, Other Agencies, Curriculum.)

The Commission subcommittees were as follows:

- ***Statement of Purpose.*** Developed the initial statement of purpose to clearly define the charge of the legislation. It also developed the 18 character and citizenship objectives for Commission approval.
- ***Citizenship Objectives.*** Looked at the area of citizenship values as they are part of social studies and worked with a Maryland State Department of Education panel.
- ***Processes of the Commission.*** Worked to develop effective procedures for the gathering and review of information, for Commission visits and for public hearings. It also developed procedures for Commission review of the text of individual reports and recommendations.

- ***Curriculum Information Guides from LEAs (Local Education Agencies).*** Requested materials from LEAs on their values education curricula. It gathered and analyzed these materials and presented its findings to the Commission.

- ***Interview Processes.*** Worked to develop formats for interviewing superintendents, principals and teachers. It also established general interview policies for other individuals and organizations

- ***Expert and Hearing Testimony.*** Selected expert witnesses to appear before the Commission and obtained relevant materials for presentation in hearings and meetings.

- ***Superintendents.*** Met with superintendents to obtain their views on values education. It met specifically with a committee of superintendents formed to work with the Commission.

- ***Exemplary Programs.*** Examined exemplary programs throughout Maryland and the nation to determine the most effective strategies for values education in the schools.

- ***Role of the Principal.*** Met with school principals and evaluated their role in values education. It made specific recommendations as to the role of the principal and proposed guidelines for the selection of principals. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.

- ***Role of the Teacher.*** Met with teachers and studied data gathered by other subcommittees relating to the role of the teacher in values education. It also examined problems related to discipline and disruptive behavior in the classroom, volunteer efforts by teachers and teacher pay. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.

- ***Preservice and Inservice Training.*** Examined preservice and inservice training for teachers. It evaluated existing training programs and made recommendations as to how values education could be improved by additional training for teachers.

- ***School Relations with Teacher Organizations.*** Studied the relationship between collective bargaining agreements and the role of the teacher in the school. Because there is no statewide collective bargaining agreement, it was necessary to collect and examine the contracts from each school district. This subcommittee also met with representatives of the Maryland State Teachers Association, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

- ***Guidance Counselors.*** Examined the role of the guidance counselor and its impact on values education in the schools. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.

- ***Other-Agency Coordination.*** Examined the role of the courts, social services, law enforcement and other agencies which have an impact on values education in the schools. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.
- ***Parents.*** Met with parents organizations and individual parents to examine how parents could participate in values education programs within the curriculum and advance the emphasis in the schools. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.
- ***Curriculum.*** Studied various curricula in Maryland and the nation and made recommendations as to how values education in the school curriculum could be improved. Prepared report for inclusion in final Commission report.

Individual subcommittee chairmen were responsible for coordinating the development of reports that were then considered by the full Commission.

Once the framework for study was established, what actions were taken?

Quite early we decided the only way to elicit open and honest discussion was to close some subcommittee sessions to the public. This proved controversial. The press pressured for all meetings to be public. Newspaper headlines proclaimed that the Commission was holding "SECRET" meetings. Prominent Commissioners were quoted as making statements such as, "I will not go and talk to any school official with the press present."

The Commission consulted the State Attorney General, who issued an opinion which stated, in part:[8]

> "...it is my understanding that there are generally no more than three or four Commission members who attend these sessions. Obviously, that number does not constitute a quorum of the twenty-four member Commission.... these are not meetings called for the purpose of transacting public business but interview sessions and investigatory visits whose sole purpose is to gather data which will be of assistance in formulating guidelines for the teaching of values in the public school system. Therefore, these visits and/or interview sessions do not fall within the provision of Article 76A, S10, and may be held in closed session."

We continued with the closed meetings, but most sessions were open to the public and the press. The Commission issued an open invitation to individuals and groups who wished to testify and accepted written statements from those who could not attend.

The Commission worked hard to reach a broad cross section of the state. The list of witnesses testifying at one of our public hearings included: David Hornbeck, Maryland Superintendent of Schools; Eugene Karol, Superintendent of Schools in Calvert County; William O'Reilly, Director of the Maryland Federation of Catholic Laity; Merrill T. Egger, President-elect of the Maryland Association of Elementary School Administrators; Cecil Short, President-elect of the Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals; and Joy Ann Fox, a parent.

What forms did the data gathering take?

The Commission collected information on values education programs from a wide variety of sources. Commission members met with staff members at the central offices of local education agencies, parents, students, teachers and representatives of teacher organizations. The data gathering took two forms: formal public testimony before the full Commission and informal information gathering by the subcommittees. It is important to note that the data was gathered by Commission members and not professional researchers. Information gathering included:

- Surveys of values education programs and strategies for teaching them within Maryland.
- Surveys of values education programs and strategies for teaching them across the nation.
- Data gathering on vandalism, violence, drug and alcohol abuse, suspensions, truancy, etc. The Commission was able to get representative data on these areas but was hampered by the lack of centralized records within the state. Also, many schools view this information as sensitive and not suitable for public release.
- Evaluation of the values education programs in Maryland by Dr. Russell Hill, former Director of Moral and Citizenship Education, Research for Better Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and by Dr. James Binko, Dean of the School of Education and Instructional Technology, Towson State University, Towson, Maryland.
- Visits to 37 selected urban, suburban and rural area schools with diverse socio-economic populations to interview principals, teachers and students. These schools were selected on the recommendation of the State Principals' Association and subcommittee chairmen.
- Private interviews with teachers, principals, students and other representing public and private agencies. These interviews allowed those actually involved in the educational process to express their personal views without fear of repercussions.

- Public hearings following the issuance of reports. (Originally, we planned to have hearings following each of the six major reports, but time constraints made this plan impossible.)
- Testimony of expert witnesses in various areas such as education, law enforcement, social services, labor, state government and state and national teachers associations.

The Commission intentionally delayed hearing expert testimony until it had completed its research so that comparisons could be made. In retrospect, it would have been more valuable to individual Commissioners if the orientation to the complex area of values education had taken place prior to the time they began their individual research.

Out of all this work emerged six major reports and fifty-one recommendations which appeared in a final report, presented to the Governor on March 21, 1983.

How was the work coordinated and liaison established between the Commission and various agencies and school districts?

All work was coordinated by the Chairman and the Vice Chairwoman, using the State Department of Education and designated staff as a primary base for contact between Commissioners, educational and governmental agencies, the general public and the media.

In order to achieve the broadest perspective, the Commission worked with numerous state agencies, local agencies and other groups. This liaison took many forms:

- Initially, a special assistant to the State Superintendent of Schools was appointed to work with the Commission. She worked with the Vice Chairwoman to structure the state into six regions for study and acted as liaison with state agencies and school personnel.
- An Assistant Attorney General was designated to work with the Commission and provide legal advice. The Attorney General's office assisted the Commission in examining questions related to the authority to teach values, authority to hold closed session interviews, the rights of schools in dealing with discipline and disruptive behavior and State laws governing actions of the schools.
- The Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Citizenship Objectives Subcommittee were appointed to represent the Commission

on a State Department of Education Task Force, creating a framework for Social Studies under a bylaw of the State Board of Education.

- A special subcommittee, chaired by the Commission Chairman, met with a specially formed committee of superintendents of schools. These meetings stressed the need for the development of a systematic approach to teaching values district-wide. The Committee provided the Commission with valuable insights into the local autonomy issue.

- The Curriculum Subcommittee requested that educators at all levels, state and national, including university faculty, review the Commission's proposed curriculum report. All of these educators agreed with the thrust of the report.

- Materials explaining the purpose of the Commission and the character and citizenship values were sent to groups representing teachers, parents, administrators, principals and superintendents throughout the state. These groups were asked to present the Commission with their recommendations.

  Groups which contributed testimony or provided materials to the Commission included:

  Chief State School Officer, Juvenile Services, members of the Judiciary, Maryland State Teachers Association, Maryland State Board of Education, National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, High School Guidance Counselors and experts on guidance counseling, School Security, Mental Health & Hygiene, Churches, Social Services, Maryland Association of Boards of Education, Prince George's County Education Association, State PTA, Business, Public School Superintendents Association, Maryland Professional Development Academy, State Department of Education, Governor's Office, Attorney General's Office, County Boards of Education, Maryland State Association of Boards of Education, Maryland Association of Elementary School Principals, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals, Maryland Federation of Catholic Laity.

- The Commission made presentations explaining its work at the Maryland Humanities Conference, Maryland Association of Secondary School Principals, State PTA, Maryland Association of Boards of Education, Maryland State Teachers Association, Salisbury State College, University of Maryland, Maryland State Board of Education and to the Governor.

How was the work of the Commission received?

"Schools can rise no higher than the communities that support them. And to blame schools for the 'rising tide of mediocrity' is to confuse symptoms with the disease."[9]

Our work was received with interest, hope and trepidation. Most people conceded that we were addressing an issue of inescapable importance. However, there was a feeling among some educators that yet another societal problem was being thrust upon the schools — a problem impossible for them to solve alone. Others claimed that "national values and ideals" were already reflected in their curriculum offerings. On the other hand, one school administrator stated, "we see the school as an extension of the home," and publicly expressed his intention "to do more to bring about a greater consciousness of values throughout his students entire educational experience."

The press acknowledged the need for values education as an "effort to overcome a kind of moral malnutrition;" yet, was quick to point out the pitfalls of trying to teach values without "force-feeding beliefs." Ray Jenkins, editor of the Editorial Page of the *Baltimore Evening Sun*, wrote:

> "... But the problem inevitably arises when it comes to the actual teaching of values. It seems to me that formalizing values education is doomed from the outset for the simple reason that schools must begin by expressly *excluding* the principal source of values common to most people, which is religion. Courts do not permit entanglement of religion and the public schools."

"Our most cherished documents: The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, reaffirm the values which have shaped this country's destiny. The documents contain the words, phrases and concepts which illuminate the principles that have guided us for 200 years. They clearly reflect both Judeo-Christian tradition and our Western intellectual tradition. These are the very principles and values which sustained us in our earliest days. They are the principles which have continued to sustain us through wars, adversities and national upheavals."[10]

A countering argument might be: Do we abolish our institutions and throw out the American Constitution because the underlying principles such as justice, equality, compassion, mercy, etc., are synonymous with principles of the religious traditions of the world?

In our meetings around the state, we heard a recurring theme. It was expressed in many different ways, but in the final analysis, what many people said was that they didn't trust teachers to teach their values. Many voiced the opinion that values should be taught at home and schools should be neutral.

But, is neutrality on values really possible? The school is a community and a miniature political system. The issues facing each are manifestations of problems confronting society as a whole. Like society, it has a system of justice and notions of equity. These values *are* — or *are not* — reflected by the patterns set by the school administrator. The student is instructed — one way or the other — through this modeling.

Teachers teach values by the way they conduct their classes. When a teacher fails to stress the positive values, he or she ends up stressing negative concepts by default. For example, if a teacher takes no stand on the acceptability of cheating on an exam and does nothing to prevent or inhibit cheating by students, this inaction becomes an endorsement of

cheating. If a teacher stands by and watches one student copy another's paper, his or her inaction does not convey the message: "I am neutral about cheating." Instead, it conveys the message: "I see you cheating and I do not object." The teacher who does nothing to control cheating, in fact, endorses it.

Teacher groups were concerned about the Commission from the beginning. To some degree, it's easy to understand why.

Traditionally, when social, political or economic problems arise in our society, special interest groups look to the schools for solutions. Often the answer for special interest groups is adding new subjects to an already crowded curriculum. A few current examples are: law-related education, free enterprise, environmental and consumer education courses.

When the report dealing with teachers was issued, Janice Piccinini, President of the Maryland State Teachers' Association, announced: "We are totally in favor of doing what they recommend." However, she noted that some teachers were restive about some parts of the report such as the recommendation that teachers get involved in more voluntary activities.

"The majority of teachers have second jobs, or else they take courses after work. Many are afraid of the impact that this volunteer concept can have on our evaluations. We think this goes beyond the Commission's charge.

"We understand that teachers should be role models, but we want them (the Commission) to get out of our contracts. The Commission has found nothing in the present contract which would hinder the teaching of ethics in schools," she said.

Many of the State's 1,325 principals felt threatened by the report on the "Role of Principal" because it included a suggestion that citizens not employed by the school system play some role in the selection of principals. Not surprisingly, the State Secondary School Principals' Association reacted quite negatively to the Report.

There was great concern by local school districts that the Commission planned to mandate a special curriculum and that the local school board would lose some of its authority. These boards prize the autonomy which makes it possible for them to decide the specific needs of their particular community. It became the Commission's job to convince the educational community that this was not our intention.

Building a spirit of trust and consensus became our most important objective. The whole purpose of our meetings throughout the state was to gain insight on a set of traditional American values to which all could agree and a process by which these values could be transmitted to our children. We became convinced that once people began discussing the values they held important, it would be possible to devise practical ways to inculcate them through the current school curriculum. For example, courage could be explored in English through the reading of biographies of great Americans; integrity could be examined in science when dis-

cussing the need for keeping accurate results; respect for law could be developed as a natural part of social studies; respect for the beliefs and traditions of others could be achieved through teaching the religious traditions of the world.

What recommendations appeared in the final report?

"Let the states send a strong message of guidance, challenge, and hope for education and accompany it with clearly articulated expectations for education in schools."[11]

The Commission completed its work by making fifty-one recommendations. They are directed to the Governor, the Legislature, State and local boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, guidance counselors and parents.

The recommendations cover a wide spectrum of activities and range from lending moral support to spending money. Perhaps the three key recommendations are 1) local school boards adopt the ten character and eight citizenship objectives as their own; 2) with the involvement of the community, begin action immediately with the existing resources rather than waiting for some idealized time when everything needed to complete all fifty-one recommendations is in place; and 3) create task forces to coordinate agency and community resources to meet the needs of the schools.

Asking school districts to spend more money and to shift existing resources is controversial. *The Maryland Values Education Commission Report* (hereinafter referred to as *The Report*) asks for policy decisions as well as strong commitment on the part of all educators and teachers organizations. Recognizing these realities, the Commission made a number of recommendations to various groups.

The Governor and State Legislature. Most of the recommendations require action at the local level rather than relying on directives from the State. The Governor and Legislature are asked to support the expansion of the Professional Development Academy for principals and to take action in creating a statewide interagency coordinating council to encourage cooperation and draw on the various resources of government, other institutions and the community-at-large.

The State and Local Boards of Education. Most of the recommendations require action by State or local school boards. The recommendations include raising the expectations, qualifications and salaries of principals, teachers and guidance counselors. This may involve the dismissal and replacement of some personnel and the renegotiation of contracts. School boards are asked to provide additional training for teachers and principals in the areas such as motivation, discipline and the focus on values in the curriculum.

School discipline is a major concern. The Commission Report recommends that school boards indemnify teachers against lawsuits resulting from their reasonable actions carrying out their responsibilities in enforcing standards of behavior conducive to learning. It recommends that an alternative facility be provided for chronically disruptive students. It recommends moving students from crowded schools to vacant ones or those earmarked for closing in order to provide for more individualized attention.

The boards are also asked to create codes of rights and responsibilities for administrators, teachers, students, and parents. It is also recommended that school systems make better use of the talent, skills and financial resources of the larger community by establishing citizen advisory boards and interagency councils.

The School Administrators. The Commission found a direct relationship between the character and leadership ability of the principal and the degree to which character and citizenship values were reflected in the school. In essence it concluded: Strong leadership equals strong schools.

The Commission recommends that principals be held to a higher standard and that they obtain additional training in specific areas. The net result is that some principals could be dismissed and others shifted to non-leadership roles. As stated earlier, higher standards and increased responsibility should be rewarded with higher pay and larger support staffs. State and local superintendents of schools are requested to take on major responsibilities for implementing Commission recommendations after State and local boards of education have acted upon them and determined the best course of action.

The Teachers. The Commission recommends that greater responsibilities be placed on teachers, including teaching values in all courses from kindergarten through twelfth grade; assuming more responsibility as role models, including additional out-of-class responsibilities; completing additional training courses; and taking an active leadership role in protecting school property and maintaining discipline. The Commission recommends pay increases and increased protection of teachers from physical and legal threats and damages. School authorities are encouraged to give full support to achieve these goals.

The Guidance Counselors. The Commission also recommends additional duties for guidance counselors. They are asked to play an expanded role in implementing the character and citizenship objectives. More guidance counselors are needed for elementary schools and the professional staff is asked to provide early identification of students with special needs. The Commission also recommends a careful analysis of the duties of counselors and, if necessary, provision for more clerical support to free them for more direct dealings with students. It is also recommended that guidance counselors take on the added responsibilities for teaching inservice courses to teachers.

"...we need to restore good old fashioned discipline. In too many schools across the land, teachers can't teach because they lack the authority to make students take tests and hand in homework. Some don't even have the authority to quiet down their class. In some schools, teaches suffer verbal and physical abuse...This must stop...We need to write stricter discipline codes, then support our teachers when they enforce those codes."[12]

"A society is a number of people held together because they are working along common lines, in a common spirit, and with reference to common aims... The radical reason that the present school cannot organize itself as a natural social unit is because just this element of common and productive activity is absent."[13]

"One thing is certain. The moral sense develops under the discipline and examples that define desirable behavior. This must be supported by stern measures to check or prevent misconduct."[14]

The Parents. Since character and citizenship values are formed largely in the home, parents have a greater responsibility in those areas than do the schools. A unique recommendation of the Commission is the drafting of a code of parental responsibilities and rights. Parents must do more than send their children to school and find fault. Parents must supply the school system with their interpretations of character and citizenship values through public and private meetings with school personnel and uphold the school policies that result. They should be involved further by serving on boards, panels, committees, and commissions dealing with schools.

Other-Agency Cooperation and Discipline and Disruptive Behavior. The Commission found that other-agency cooperation is essential because it involves parents and other agencies outside of the schools in a shared responsibility for values education. The use of other agencies also provides a rich reservoir of resources that the schools can utilize to encourage the growth of *positive* values in students as well as deal with their disruptive behavior problems, learning disabilities and emotional disturbances. The Commission determined that the school environment should be controlled by the rule of law that applies in the adult world and that agencies beyond the jurisdiction of the educational system could be effective in giving support to this area of immense concern.

The Commission recommends that the State government establish an interagency council to coordinate cooperative activities between public and private agencies and the schools and that task forces be established in each school district to examine other-agency cooperation in the teaching of values. Individual task forces could also assist school districts in quantifying the magnitude of disruptive behavior problems, developing long range plans to deal with the causes and effects of these problems, and assisting in developing resources to meet these problems.

Curriculum Implications. Every school district in Maryland adopted the Commission's character and citizenship goals but most felt they were adequately teaching character and citizenship values indirectly throughout the curriculum. The Commission disagreed, stating that even in a school with competent leadership and faculty and a dedication to achieving certain character and citizenship objectives, the absence of an organized curricular approach seems to result in confusion and limited achievement. The Commission rejected certain approaches to values education that teach moral relativism and the claim by a leading advocate of values clarification that traditional American values have become "meaningless platitudes or hypocritical meanderings." Rather, it agreed with the words of Edwin Delattre[15] who, in commenting on this assertion, acknowledged the massive changes that have taken place in contemporary society but asserted that:

> "The changes have not altered the fundamental features of what was formerly called and can still be called, an honorable life. Judgment is not bigotry and indiscriminate sensitivity and tolerance may just be other terms for indifference."

The Commission made the following recommendations:

- First and foremost, schools must have strong programs in history, government, literature and the arts.
- Textbooks and library materials must be carefully evaluated to ensure that the opportunity exists for students to harvest the richness of the humanities.
- Extra-curricular activities must be given careful attention and used to help students understand concepts such as teamwork and interdependency and to develop self-esteem.
- The world's great religions should be examined in a secular manner to provide students with understanding and respect for the beliefs and traditions of others.
- Students should become familiar with the moral choices involved in social issues such as poverty, hunger, ecology and nuclear war.
- Human services projects that expose students to the needs and concerns of the elderly, the poor, the handicapped and the sick should be developed.
- Parents must be informed of the school's goals and efforts should be made to involve parents as active partners in this undertaking.

"A core of common learning is essential. The basic curriculum should be a study of those consequential ideas, experiences, and traditions common to all of us by virtue of our membership in the human family at a particular moment in history."[16]

"...helping other people is a value that schools should reinforce among students in concert with the wider community. We may or may not have the responsibility to be our brother's keeper. Surely we have the responsibility to be our brother's helper."[17]

The Commission recommends that each school develop its own program based upon the following general guidelines:

- The program should involve the entire school community and the appropriate community resource agencies.
- The program should begin in kindergarten and continue through twelfth grade. Values education should be incorporated into every subject whenever possible.
- The program should be well known to the entire school community and continuing efforts must be made to maintain reasonable standards of achievement.
- The program must be organized, comprehensive and sequential in nature, building upon earlier efforts and appropriate to each age level.
- The program must recognize that moral education must have an individual as well as a social dimension.
- The program must recognize the need and opportunity for teacher training.

"Values education cannot be a passive affair based solely on the transmission of information. It requires as basic conditions that students be involved actively in developing and defending their own positions."[18]

The Maryland Commission concludes that the majority of citizens favor a more active character and citizenship education effort but what to teach and how to teach it should be addressed *at all levels* of the school system, particularly the local school. It requests the State Department of Education to assist those local school districts wishing to implement values education by establishing a resource center for character and citizenship

"...We must do everything to restore education to its place in the hierarchy of national values that we as educators know it deserves if the other values of the nation are to be preserved, revitalized and transmitted to future generations."[19]

"But it isn't just basic subjects that need to be taught, it's also basic values . . . Unless we educate our children all that we are, the great devotions, the crucial writings and technical knowledge that have permitted millions to live in abundance and freedom, then all these successes are in jeopardy. If we fail to instruct our children in justice, religion and liberty, we will be condemning them to a world without virtue. They will live in a twilight of civilization where great truths were forgotten."[20]

education programs and by providing technical assistance. Finally, it recommends that the Governor use his good office to see that the Commission's list of character and citizenship values are displayed in every classroom in the State.

The Report ends with:

> "During the four years of our deliberations, the Commission members have been constantly reminded, or in some cases, have learned an important and vital lesson. In spite of divergent ethnic and religious backgrounds, differing work experience, and varying political interests, we have, through open and informed discussion, been able to reach strong and clear agreement on a difficult subject of grave concern for all citizens of this country. It is a process which we believe exemplifies the genius and glory of a free democratic system. But this fragile jewel of human civilization must be carefully nurtured by a concerned citizenry that understands and is committed to its maintenance and its basic values.
>
> The ultimate goal is to teach our students to recognize, relate, assimilate and apply these character and citizenship values in their lives. This would produce better citizens and in turn, a better society."

The Commission's recommendations do not carry the force of law and are not requirements. The Commission worked to develop a non-threatening approach to address the needs of schools in this area and to help those people — administrators, teachers and others — on the firing line. The fifty-one recommendations were designed to involve local school boards, other local groups and concerned citizens in the formulation of local programs. What should evolve in Maryland, with the Commission's recommendations as a guide, is local school policy set by local school boards. (The fifty-one recommendations appear in Appendix D.)

Who received copies of the Commission Report?

The Resolution establishing the Commission required that the final report be sent to the Governor, the President of the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Schools and that it be circulated generally throughout the State of Maryland. The resulting sweep of dissemination is broad because *The Report* is broad. The Commission has requested communities across the State to look at their needs for values education and allocate and coordinate their resources toward that goal. It has asked families to be more involved in the schools and for business, the voluntary sector and the churches to make experiences available to students to help them grow positively. It has asked for a spirit of cooperation from leadership that is reflected in policies favorable to values

education. The full list of those individuals and groups who initially received copies of *The Report*, under a letter of transmittal by Governor Harry Hughes, appears below:

- ○ Each member of the Governor's Cabinet
- ○ Heads of government agencies (state and local as outlined in *The Report*)
- ○ Each legislator in the Maryland General Assembly
- ○ Joanne T. Goldsmith, President of the Maryland State Board of Education
- ○ Each member of the Maryland State Board of Education
- ○ David W. Hornbeck, Maryland State Superintendent of Schools
- ○ Joseph L. Shilling, Deputy State Superintendent of Schools
- ○ Richard J. Deasy, Assistant State Superintendent for Instruction
- ○ James W. Latham, Director, Office of Curriculum Development
- ○ Maryland State Department of Education's Public Affairs
- ○ Maryland's twenty-four local school superintendents
- ○ Each member of Maryland's twenty-four local school boards
- ○ Principals of every public and private school in Maryland
- ○ State PTA President
- ○ Local PTA presidents
- ○ Teachers organizations (state and local)
- ○ Teachers unions
- ○ Institutions of higher learning (state universities and community colleges)
- ○ Maryland Professional Academy for Principals
- ○ League of Women Voters
- ○ Various educational organizations, i.e., Association of Elementary School Principals, etc.
- ○ Religious institutions (representative organizations and selected churches and synagogues)
- ○ Service Clubs (Rotary, Jaycees, Lions, etc.)
- ○ National Conference of Christians and Jews
- ○ State Chamber of Commerce
- ○ Each local Chamber of Commerce
- ○ Greater Baltimore Committee
- ○ Greater Salisbury Committee
- ○ Press (print and non-print) in each of the twenty-four school districts.

Since the initial dissemination of *The Report* to key individuals in the categories above, the Maryland State Department of Education has responded to numerous requests for *The Report* from citizens in Maryland and across the nation.

What are the specific outcomes of the Maryland Values Education Commission?

Some of the outcomes are:

- A model process to unify divergent thinking around a common core of traditional American values that can serve as a national model.
- A report with 51 recommendations that identifies the full scope of values education and the action steps necessary for Maryland.
- An increased emphasis on values in a new mandated social studies framework in Maryland.[21]
- A district-wide values education initiative, led by a local school superintendent in Maryland.[22]
- A grand jury charge by a circuit court judge to study the teaching of values in Batimore City's schools.[23]
- The heightened awareness and debate on local, state and national levels.
- Landmark legislation in 1982 making federal funds available to teach the principles of citizenship. Secretary Terrel Bell's proposed education budget for fiscal 1985 would increase these block grant funds by 52 percent.[24]
- The formation of three national organizations dedicated to promoting the teaching of citizenship principles:

  1. *The Center for Citizenship Education*, Washington, D. C., was created in 1978 as a non-profit organization to promote citizenship education throughout the country. It has been instrumental in creating national awareness of the Maryland Experience, worked with the White House and local and federal officials on citizenship and values education issues and developed educational materials for teachers, students and administrators to teach the principles of citizenship.

     The Center organized three national meetings which, in 1981, led to the creation of:

2. *The Council for the Advancement of Citizenship*, Washington, D. C., a national consortium of individuals and organizations working toward the revitalization of citizenship in America. The Council has sponsored the Jennings Randolph Citizenship Forums and numerous other activities.
3. *The Citizenship Education Foundation, Inc.*, Rockville, Maryland, was created in 1983 to promote the development of citizenship and values education programs within the state of Maryland as well as the Maryland Experience process nationwide.

The work of the Maryland Values Education Commission is a beginning. It shows that the issues surrounding values education are complex and controverisal. It also proves that these issues can be resolved. Parents, teachers, and government officials throughout the country can now look to *The Maryland Experience* as the first of *many* actions to restore citizenship and values education to our schools on a planned, comprehensive and systematic basis.

"A principal aim of this legislation should be the consideration of how our educational institutions can play a greater role in the development of values among our young people. However, such legislation should also take into account that there is a strongly felt need that the strengthening of moral and ethical standards is a present concern in respect to other areas of our society; and therefore, strengthening efforts should not be confined to educational institutions."

—Jane C. Gude
—(Excerpt from written testimony to the Maryland General Assembly in support of SJR-64 on March 8, 1978.)

reflections

"We do not have to wallow helplessly in the face of disintegrating influences: we can act!"
—Hon. Eugene J. Zander
Cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 64 in the House of Delegates of the Maryland General Assembly

In August, 1983, a questionnaire was sent to all members of the Maryland Values Education Commission. The purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit comments and suggestions about the Maryland Experience which could provide guidance to citizens of other states in their efforts to examine values and citizenship education programs. These representative comments are especially helpful because they reflect the ideas of the persons who planned and carried out the work of the Maryland Values Education Commission.

Question:

What practical benefits has the Commission produced for the State of Maryland?

Response:

- ○ It has raised the level of awareness about values and citizenship education; it has shown the necessity of having character and citizenship values as integral parts of the public education system.
- ○ It has shown that the current approach to values and citizenship education is highly fragmented.
- ○ It has demonstrated how parents, community leaders, educators and other groups within the community can work together on this important issue.
- ○ It has shown conclusively that members of the community can agree on a common set of citizenship and character goals.

- ○ It has provided elected officials and those responsible for education programs with specific recommendations.
- ○ It has provided advocates of improved values and citizenship education with specific information and materials.
- ○ It has furnished an enlightened look at the burden societal goals have placed on our schools and shown the need for other agencies in government and the community to assist the schools in order to achieve the goals of values education.

Question:

If the Commission were to start over again, how could it produce the same benefits more efficiently (in less time or at less cost)?

Response:

- ○ Create an executive committee to provide greater structure for the early work.
- ○ Develop a comprehensive work plan for the Commission so that members are aware of the time and responsibilities involved and can plan accordingly.
- ○ Do not add new members after the work of the Commission has begun.
- ○ Make better use of the resources of the state agencies involved with the work of the Commission.
- ○ Use a professional staff director and other support personnel where appropriate to coordinate and expedite the work of the Commission.
- ○ Utilize full-day meetings of the Commission where appropriate. Two-hour meetings did not provide enough time to review documents and materials prepared by the Commission.

Question:

What else do you wish the Commission had done?

Response:

- ○ Held more public meetings around the state to familiarize the general public with the work of the Commission.
- ○ Utilized the State Public Broadcasting System to better inform the public of the work of the Commission.
- ○ Created better liaison with groups (other than the Maryland State Department of Education) representing history and social studies teachers.
- ○ Recommended that a cabinet-level post be established to aid in the implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

Question:

What advice would you give to citizens setting up a similar Commission in another state?

Response:

- ○ Get support from the Governor, State Superintendent of Schools and members of the legislature as early in the planning process as possible.
- ○ Avoid the use of the word "values" in the name of your Commission. A term like "citizenship principles" is less controversial.
- ○ Make the Commission autonomous, reporting only to the Governor.
- ○ Involve the local press at the planning stage so that the general public will be familiar with the purpose of the Commission and thus able to follow its work.
- ○ Avoid the temptation to try and reform public education; stick with the narrow purpose of the Commission.
- ○ Involve the full Commission in the early planning stage of the work.
- ○ Define the mission and come to agreement on the time frame of the work as close together as possible in order to assure continuity of the work with the original Commission membership.
- ○ Be sure that all potential Commission members have a clear idea of the time and work involved, prior to their appointment to the Commission, so that each can make an informed decision about becoming a member.
- ○ Have a specific budget approved for the Commission.
- ○ Utilize professional staff support, especially for research.
- ○ Identify persons as advocates/implementors who will be able to aid the Commission in implementing its recommendations.
- ○ Prepare and distribute summaries of each Commission meeting to all interested groups.
- ○ Try to respect the inherent wisdom that children have for their own lives and find ways to encourage parents, legislators and community leaders to promote that concept.

gaining support for a state level values education commission established by the legislature

"The Maryland Experience started as an idea. It became a movement. It responds to all of the negative attention schools have received with a positive plan of action for renewal. It is an excellent expression of our democracy in action."

—Senator Laurence Levitan
Cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 64 in the Senate of the Maryland General Assembly

One of the most important tasks facing any individual or group working to implement *The Maryland Experience* in another state is to develop strong, early support at all levels. Initially, this support should be developed among the general public, government officials and members of the educational establishment. The support of these groups is critical when moving into the legislative phase.

Although improved values and citizenship education is an idea which a large majority of citizens, officials and educators support, this support must be solidified so it can serve as the basis for a plan of action. The controversial nature of the topic makes it extremely important to consolidate this support early by demonstrating to the individuals and groups involved that what is contemplated is really quite simple:

- Identify the consensus values within the community.
- Determine if and to what extent these values are being taught in the schools.
- Make recommendations for improving the quality of values education in the schools.

A 1983 survey of Baltimore County, MD, revealed that 79 percent of the responding parents believe it is the responsibility of the public school system to teach values. 44 percent of the parents also felt current efforts were not sufficient. When asked to define values education, these

parents responded with concepts such as right from wrong, citizenship, honesty, moral development, work ethics, personal responsibility and respect. It is interesting to note that these values bear a striking resemblance to the character and citizenship values proposed by the Maryland Values Education Commission. The same survey revealed that 65 percent of elementary and 60 percent of secondary school teachers felt it was the responsibility of the public school system to teach values. This is in striking contrast to a 1978 survey of Prince Georges County, MD, which revealed that 69 percent of all educators thought values education was prohibited in the public schools.

Conducting such a survey in your community would be an extremely powerful tool to show the general public, government officials and the legislature that an undertaking similar to *The Maryland Experience* would serve the interests and desires of its citizens. A great deal of support can also be gained by familiarizing parents, educators and administrators with the work of the Maryland Values Education Commission, demonstrating that such a project is possible.

The next important step is to develop support among the local boards of education, state education agency and the Governor's office. These officials and groups are the most likely to be questioned by legislators when legislation is introduced. Their familiarity with the rationale underlying the legislation and their support of the objectives will have strong impact on members of the legislature. A proposal which has the acceptance of officials in related fields stands a much greater chance of receiving serious consideration from legislators than a proposal which is unfamiliar to them.

It is important to have the proposed legislation carefully drafted prior to introduction in the legislature. Also, it is an excellent time to consolidate support by asking legislators who may share this concern for their comments on the draft bill. This involvement strategy allows you to utilize the expertise of their staffs and tends to create a personal involvement with both staff and legislator. This is an invaluable asset in procuring guidance and support from those directly involved in the legislative process. It is important to obtain the strongest possible sponsorship for the legislation — for example, the chairman of a strong, highly visible, legislative committee.

The following are some general suggestions based on *The Maryland Experience*. They are by no means inclusive, but rather illustrative of some of the important areas.

- ○ Carefully research any previous efforts in this area. If they were not successful, discover why and avoid those mistakes.
- ○ Use a joint resolution format. This removes the appearance of forcing state and local boards of education to comply with a directive from the legislature. Boards of education may oppose any legislation they view as directly threatening their autonomy.
- ○ Use of a joint resolution prevents passage of differing bills which can die in a conference committee.
- ○ If the bill is amended, or cannot be presented as a joint resolution, use the version which receives the best committee report.
- ○ Prepare a position paper on values education which briefly outlines the rationale and the objectives of the legislation. Be sure to distinguish the *concept* of values education from specific approaches to values education, such as values clarification.
- ○ Distribute the position paper to legislators, govenment officials and their staffs. Use a concise, easily read format. They do not have time to decipher lengthy documents.

○ Be sure to employ professional lobbying techniques:

- — Identify the members of the committee to which the bill is assigned.
- — Present the rationale for the resolution to each committee member separately and gain the individual support of that member.
- — Bring the bill to the attention of the committee chairman to ensure that it receives a place on the agenda.
- — Develop strategies to inform legislators of support the bill has received from the general public, educators and other government officials.
- — Enlist witnesses to testify when the bill is introduced or to send letters in favor of the bill. These individuals should be highly respected in their fields and should represent major organizations such as school boards, social services, law enforcement and parents.
- — Be present when your bill is considered by committee or up for a vote on the floor of the House and Senate. Your presence is a reminder of your discussions with the legislators.

It is important to remember that this stage of development in your plan is critical. You should seek support and advice from anyone familiar with the legislative process in your state. Every novice must feel intimidated by the efforts involved and the complexities of the legislative process. However, as people begin to understand the rationale for your program and the important work it represents, you will be delighted — and inspired — by the amount of support you will receive. Happily, you will come to the full realization that our democratic machinery really WORKS!

references

Acknowledgements

1. Religious Heritage of America (RHA) is a national interfaith, non-political organization dedicated to the recognition of national leaders who make vivid in their personal, professional and public lives, the positive principles found in our religous heritage of America. RHA awardees have included United States Presidents, statesmen, members of clergy, the professions, the media and outstanding youth.

Introduction

1. Terrel H. Bell, Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah (current U. S. Secretary of Education), *Morality and Citizenship Education: Whose Responsibility?* Occasional Paper Number 1, January, 1977, p. 5. (Delivered at the National Conference for Education and Citizenship, Kansas City, Missouri, September 23, 1976.) Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

2. SOURCES OF THE VARIOUS REPORTS ON EDUCATION:

Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma Of The American High School, by Theodore Sizer, $16.95, Houghton Mifflin Company, Wayside Road, Burlington, MA 01803, Attention: Order Entry. Phone: 617/272-1500. Must be prepaid. Add $1.50 for postage and handling.

Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do, by the College Entrance Examination Board, 1983, No Charge. The College Board, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10106. Phone: 212/582-6210.

Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools, by the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983, $5.00. Education Commission of the States, Attention Terry Shinkle, Distribution Center, 1860 Lincoln, Suite 300, Denver, CO 80295. Phone: 303/830-3600.

A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, $4.50 (Stock No. 065-000-00177-2). Superintendent of Documents. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Phone: 202/783-3238.

A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, by John I. Goodlad, 1983, $18.95. *To order in the West,* contact: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 8171 Redwood Highway, Novato, CA 94947. Phone: 415/897-5298. *To order in the Midwest,* contact: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 13955 Manchester Road, Manchester, MO 63011. Phone: 314/227-1600. *To order in the East,* contact: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Princeton Road, Hightstown, NJ 08520. Phone: 609/426-5000.

Educating Americans for the 21st Century, by the National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, 1983, No Charge. National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20550. Phone: 202/357-7700.

High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, by Ernest L. Boyer, 1982, $15.00. Harper & Row, 10 East 53rd Street, New York, NY 10022. Phone: 212/593-7000.

The Paideia Proposal, by Mortimer Adler, 1982, $2.95. Macmillan Publishing Company, 866 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022. Phone: 212/935-2000.

The Maryland Experience

1. Excerpted from an interview conducted by Alvin P. Sanoff with Steven Muller, President, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, "Universities Are Turning Out Highly Skilled Barbarians," *U.S. News and World Report,* November 10, 1980.
2. Theodore Sizer, *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School,* Houghton Mifflin Company, Burlington, Massachusetts, 1984.
3. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America,* p. 288. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1983.
4. Terrel H. Bell, Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah (current U. S. Secretary of Education), *Morality and Citizenship Education: Whose Responsibility?* Occasional Paper Number 1, January, 1977, p. 4. (Delivered at the National Conference for Education and Citizenship, Kansas City, Missouri, September 23, 1976.) Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
5. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America,* p. 39. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1983.
6. The Atlantic Council's Working Group on the Successor Generation, *The Successor Generation: Its Challenges and Responsibilities,* p. 21. Atlantic Council of the United States, Policy Papers, Washington, D. C., 1981.
7. William J. Bennett, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, quoted in *The Wall Street Journal,* December 31, 1982.
8. Ellen Heller, Assistant Attorney General, was appointed as consultant to the Commission on relevant legal matters.
9. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America,* p. 6. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1983.

10. Terrel H. Bell, Commissioner of Higher Education for the State of Utah (U. S. Secretary of Eduction), *Morality and Citizenship Education: Whose Responsibility?* Occasional Paper Number 1, January, 1977, p. 4. (Delivered at the National Conference for Education and Citizenship, Kansas City, Missouri, September 23, 1976.) Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

11. John Goodlad, *A Place Called School*, p. 60. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, New York.

12. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL FORUM ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, Indianapolis Convention Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, December 8, 1983.

13. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, p. 215. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1983.

14. Mortimer J. Adler, The Paideia Proposal, An Educational Manifesto, p. 55. McMillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1982.

15. Dr. Edwin F. Delattre, President, St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland, "Where the Values Movement Goes Wrong," by Edwin F. Delattre and William J. Bennett, *Change Magazine*, February 1979, p. 40.

16. Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, p. 302. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1983.

17. David W. Hornbeck, Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, "Not the School Alone," Fall 1981 *Synergist*, p. 17.

18. Richard Morill, President, Salem Academy and College, Winston Salem, North Carolina. From address delivered July 1, 1980, Bellagio Conference on "The Role of the University in the Search for International Values Consensus." Rockefeller Foundation Report.

19. George H. Hanford, President of the College Board at its annual meeting, October 27, 1982.

20. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL FORUM ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, Indianapolis Convention Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, December 8, 1983.

21. *Social Studies, A Maryland Curricular Framework*, Maryland State Department of Education, 1983.

22. Robert Y. Dubel, Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore County, Maryland — *1984 and Beyond: A Reaffirmation of Values.*

23. Judge John Carroll Byrnes, Circuit Court, Baltimore, Maryland, "Judge Wants Grand Jury Study of Teaching of Values in Schools," *The Evening Sun*, Baltimore, Maryland, January 7, 1984.

24. Public Law 97-313, Chapter 2, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

25. Alice Pinderhughes, Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore City, Maryland, on March 20, 1984 announced the formation of a Values Education Task Force at a joint press conference with members of Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development (BUILD), which will participate in the effort.

Appendix A

approaches to values education

The *concept* of values education has often been confused with individual *strategies* to teach values. Five such approaches are: Values Clarification, Values Analysis, Moral Development, Inculcation of Values and Action Learning. A brief description of each follows below.

Values Clarification

Values Clarification became popular in the 1960s and has been used in a number of schools. Its emphasis is on the method used to choose values rather than on the specific values which are, in fact, chosen.

Students are presented with hypothetical situations and asked to choose among alternative outcomes to those situations. They are asked to evaluate their choices in terms of what they reveal about their personal values. It is expected that students will thus be able to identify their own values and gain insights into the way their values relate to the values of others. The role of the teacher in Values Clarification is to help the student examine the values chosen while remaining non-judgmental as to the values themselves. This approach has been criticized because it fails to acknowledge the existence of some common set of values which is desirable and thus promotes relativism. The basis of relativism is that everything is subjective, nothing is genuinely right or wrong, all matters of value are matters of personal taste, and matters of taste are not to be disputed.

Values Analysis

Values Analysis was developed to help students use the principles of logical thinking and scientific investigation to examine values issues and questions. Methods used in this approach include structured rational discussion requiring application of reason as well as evidence in the choice of values. It also includes debate and testing of principles. When faced with a choice between conflicting values, the student is asked to determine the extent to which certain values should be

adhered to in the face of competing values. This approach does assume the existence of a set of basic ideals and its goal is for students to be able to understand their decisions more clearly as a result of examining the complex choices which must be made when values compete. Disadvantages of this approach include the need for substantial teacher training in order to provide the expertise to teach Values Analysis, as well as the need for students to possess a high level of analytical skills.

Moral Development

The Moral Development approach is largely based on the work of Harvard professor, Lawrence Kohlberg. His theory is that all human beings go through specific stages of moral development, beginning with action motivated by avoidance of punishment and culminating with action motivated by concern for violating personal principles. This method utilizes the "moral discussion," where a group of students, presented with a moral dilemma, must identify the moral issues involved, examine their positions on these issues and interact with group members through discussion. This approach, based on universal ideals such as freedom, justice and human dignity, also relies on informal teaching throughout the environment to reflect the underlying values. It has been criticized because of its failure to fully demonstrate the validity of the proposed stages of moral development and requires students to make choices based on limited experience and immature judgments. It is further criticized because the moral dilemmas used for discussion overstress certain types of problems without always presenting alternatives that reflect real life behavior.

Inculcation of Values

Under this approach, a preexisting set of values is instilled or internalized in students by repetition and modeling. The goal is to change the values of the students so that they more nearly reflect certain desired values. The desired values are included as part of the curriculum, and the school environment is used as a reflection of those values. Major criticisms of this method are that it is ineffective in many schools because of problems in maintaining discipline and order necessary for a good learning environment and that the values chosen to be inculcated may be too narrow for use in a pluralistic society and will offend certain groups.

Action Learning

This approach allows students to examine their values in the context of social action. It encourages projects within the school and community which give students the opportunity to view themselves as socially interactive persons who are members of the school and the larger community. A feature of this approach is its emphasis on experiential as well as classroom analysis of values. The overall goal is the student's understanding that difficult moral and ethical questions often occur in day to day contexts, and that their value system will have real effect on their decisions concerning how to relate within the larger community. Criticism of this approach revolves around the need for specially designated school personnel to identify action learning experiences available in the community, make arrangements for transportation and act as liaison between school and community.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 64
(81r4089)

Introduced by Senator Levitan

Read and Examined by Proofreader:

_____
Proofreader.

_____
Proofreader.

Sealed with the Great Seal and presented to the Acting Governor, for his approval this_____day of_____ at_____o'clock,_____M.

APPROVED
BY THE GOVERNOR
MAY 16 '78

_____
President.

RESOLUTION NO. 26 H M

A Senate Joint Resolution concerning

Values Education Commission

FOR the purpose of requesting the Governor to establish a Commission to identify and assess ongoing programs in morals and values education in the schools of Maryland, if any, and to make recommendations toward the implementation of these programs into the curriculum.

Our fellow citizens generally are greatly concerned today by the apparent diminution of our traditional adherence and devotion to high standards of moral and ethical conduct. This concern is felt to pervade the areas of both private and personal interrelationships and public governmental activities.

Unhappily, all too often one observes or learns by extensive publicity of breakdowns in the normal standards of individual behavior and violations of public trust.

Although the great majority of our people are aware of this unhappy condition, a sense of helplessness as to how to bring about a remedy appears to have taken hold of their consciousness. Concentrated attention to procedures which

EXPLANATION:
Underlining indicates amendments to the resolution.
~~Double-cut~~ indicates matter stricken by amendment.

might serve to inculcate an appreciation of and devotion to our best values is called for. Responsibility for formulating a broad program of values education surely rests on the popularly elected State Legislature as well as educators.

The obvious first problems to face are: "Where do we begin, and how far do we go?" Our leading national thinkers, educators, clergymen, and learning experts agree that the elementary school is the appropriate place to start a program of appreciation of ideals and desirable personal and public conduct. It is at this time students develop positive attitudes about our form of government, moral codes, and value judgments.

The early school years are especially important because a critical stage of development is beginning – that of thinking in the abstract, making judgments that will form the basis of character for the years to come.

But these concerns must be carried through to middle school, high school, and college, and into personal and public life. The intermediate years are times of experimentation and value assessment; the upper years are periods of judgment and value testing.

~~The total curriculum should be organized around concepts which foster effective citizenship skills, and while values must not be taught explicitly, they must be taught implicitly by content examples.~~

There are large numbers of parents and educators who feel deeply that today's society and particularly our schools, must address this void in the educational orientation and development of our children; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Governor appoint a 20-member Commission, with adequate funding, for the purpose of identifying and assessing ongoing programs in moral and values education in the schools of Maryland, and to make recommendations toward the implementation of Values Education into the curriculum.

The Commission should be balanced on the State and local level, and comprised of representatives from the following: State Department of Education, State Government, State School Board, local school board, State Association of PTA's, curriculum specialists, school teachers, school principals, clergy (Judeo-Christian sector), youth, school counselors, Chamber of Commerce, Department of Labor, and Industrial Development, media, sports, service organization, and the public at large.

Suggested materials should include materials that provide good role and good deed models and attitudes that

foster a sense of civic morality. Examples are: Lives of our early founders, great Americans of the past and present, the great documents which were the basis of the heritage of America, notable statements of principle by recent minds that emphasize devotion to ethical and moral values; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this program should not require a separate course designation with its own block of time in a school period. It could, however, be an addition to or used in conjunction with all areas of the curriculum with special emphasis in Social Studies or American History. To be useful, though, it would need to be treated as a distinct element of each course with its own resources and its own unique implementation format. ~~If approached thoughtfully, and carried out skillfully, this~~ This type of "values" program will serve to foster a respect for high standards of conduct and help students make effective value judgments, and to familiarize them with their "place in the world"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That it is the sense of the General Assembly that the type of "values education" described is desirable from the point of view of elevating the general ethical and moral standards of our future citizens; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Acting Governor, the Honorable Blair Lee III; the President of the State Department of Education, the Honorable Richard Shifter, P.O. 8717, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, Baltimore, Maryland 21240; and the State Superintendent of Schools, Dr. David [illegible] Hornbeck, P.O. Box 8717, Baltimore-Washington International [illegible]irport, Baltimore, Maryland 21240; and be published generally throughout the State.

Approved:

_____
Acting Governor.

_____
President of the Senate.

_____
Speaker of the House of Delegates.

Appendix C

RICHARD SCHIFTER
PRESIDENT

PLEASE REPLY TO
6907 CRAIL DRIVE
BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20034

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 8717
BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21240

May 21, 1979

Stephen H. Sachs, Esquire
Attorney General
1 South Calvert Building
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

I am addressing this letter to you in my capacity as Chairman of the Values Education Commission.

The Commission has asked me to request your opinion on the following question: Are there any legal impediments to the teaching of ethical values in the public schools?

This question has arisen because members of the Commission have been told by teachers and other school officials that the teaching of values may violate the principle of separation of church and state. Since the Commission first instructed me to write to you, I came across the enclosed article by Harry J. Hogan, in the May 20, 1979 issue of the New York Times, which states most succinctly the point of view with which our Commission is concerned: "There is no way that ethics can be taught in state-supported schools and universities without violating the First Amendment prohibition against the establishment of religion."

It is our Commission's impression that Mr. Hogan's statement and the similar views expressed by staff members of our State's public school systems are incorrect. We, therefore, request your opinion on this subject, so that the Boards of Education and staffs of our State's public school systems can be properly advised.

Sincerely yours,

Richard Schifter

Richard Schifter

RS/rmc
Enclosure

STEPHEN H. SACHS
ATTORNEY GENERAL

GEORGE A. NILSON
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
383-3724

ELEANOR M. CAREY
ASSOCIATE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
383-3727

MICHAEL A. MILLEMANN
CHIEF GENERAL COUNSEL AND
CHIEF, CIVIL DIVISION
383-3742

AVERY AISENSTARK
PRINCIPAL COUNSEL
OPINIONS AND ADVICE
383-3747

DAVID H. FELDMAN
CHIEF OF LITIGATION
383-3788

JAMES G. KLAIR
COUNSEL FOR ADMINISTRATION
383-3760

OFFICES OF

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ONE SOUTH CALVERT BUILDING

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202

301-383-3737

DEBORAH K. HANDEL, CHIEF
CRIMINAL APPEALS AND CORRECTIONAL
LITIGATION DIVISION
383-3788

DEBORAH E. JENNINGS, CHIEF
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION
383-3733

CHARLES O. MONK II, CHIEF
ANTITRUST DIVISION
383-2082

OTHER OFFICES:

H. ROBERT ERWIN, JR., CHIEF
CONSUMER PROTECTION DIVISION
131 E. REDWOOD STREET
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202
383-5344

ANDREW C. TARTAGLINO, CHIEF
MEDICAID FRAUD CONTROL UNIT
16 CHARLES PLAZA
SUITE 301 - ST
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201
383-7900

ROBERT A. ZARNOCH, COUNSEL
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
104 LEGISLATIVE SERVICES BUILDING
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401
269-3786

July 19, 1979

Mr. Richard Schifter
Chairman
Values Education Commission
6907 Crail Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20034

Dear Mr. Schifter:

On behalf of the Values Education Commission ("Commission"), you have requested our opinion on whether there are any legal impediments to the teaching of ethical values in the public schools. According to your recent letter, this issue has arisen because members of the Commission have been told by various school personnel and parents that the teaching of values may violate the First Amendment principles of separation of church and state as well as certain privacy rights. For the reasons given below, we have concluded that the fact that ethical values are taught in the public school system does not, standing alone, violate the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution 1/ or any privacy rights arising under the First Amendment. In reaching this conclusion, we have addressed only the narrow but crucial issue of constitutionality. We have not reviewed any particular curriculum materials to see if they comport with the tenets of the First Amendment. It has not been necessary to do so in order to resolve the constitutional questions. However, it is important to point out that although, in theory, the teaching of values in the public school system

---

1/ "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

is not constitutionally deficient, certain specific subjects and methodologies taught or employed in the name of "values education" could, in fact, violate the religion clauses or the privacy rights of a student. For example, courses that foster a "religion" or secularism, group sensitivity sessions that intrude relentlessly into a student's inner thoughts, and compulsory questionnaires that focus on a student's emotional feelings and probe family interpersonal relationships appear to us to present serious constitutional problems in a public school setting. But analysis of these possible issues is not our present task.

The interplay of the two religion clauses of the First Amendment, which prevent the establishment of religion and prohibit infringement of its free exercise, have been given broad meaning and interpretation by the Supreme Court. As summarized in Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1, 15 (1947): "The structure of our government has, for the preservation of civil liberty, rescued the temporal institutions from religious interference. On the other hand, it has secured religious liberty from the invasion of the civil authority."

Accordingly, two fundamental principles of "voluntarism" and "separation" emerge from these complementary clauses. The Free Exercise Clause guarantees freedom from any degree of coercion in matters of belief while the Establishment Clause, through the principle of separatism, ensures the integrity of church and state. Note, Toward a Constitutional Definition of Religion, 91 Harv. L. Rev. 1056, 1058 (1978). The confines of the Establishment Clause have been stated as follows:

> "The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. . . .In the words of Jefferson, the clause was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State.'" Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1, 15-16 (1947), quoting Reynold v. United States, 98 U.S. 145, 164 (1878).

Thus, the Supreme Court has given this clause a liberal but firm interpretation that its object "was to create a complete and

permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion." Id. at 31-32. To be upheld under the strictures of the Establishment Clause: the purpose of a law or activity must be clearly secular; its primary effect must neither advance nor inhibit religion; and it must avoid excessive governmental entanglements with religion. Committee for Public Education v. Nyquist, 413 U.S. 756, 773 (1973).

Expressed another way, the proper role of the government is one of neutrality in religious theory, doctrine, and practice. Epperson v. Arkansas, 393 U.S. 97, 103-04 (1968); Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203, 222 (1963). This neutrality carries over to the Free Exercise Clause, which recognizes the value of religious training and observance and focuses on the individual's right to choose his or her own course in religion "free of any compulsion from the state." Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. at 222. Therefore, to determine that a law or activity violates the Free Exercise Clause, it is necessary to show some type of coercion. Religious groups often invoke this clause to gain exemption from general regulatory statutes, and a balancing test that weighs any incidental burden on an individual's free exercise of religion against a compelling state interest in the regulation of a particular subject has emerged. Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398, 403 (1963). 2/

Of course, before applying any of the applicable tests there must be a determination of whether the teaching of morals and ethics in the curriculum of the public schools constitutes a religious activity. Recently, the Third Circuit, in Malnak v. Yogi, Nos. 78-1568 and 78-1882 (3rd Cir. Feb. 2, 1979), aff'g 440 F. Supp. 1284 (D.N.J. 1977), held that the teaching of the Science of Creative Intelligence - Transcendental Meditation (SCI/TM) in the New Jersey public high schools constituted a religious activity and thus violated the Establishment Clause. This holding reflected past decisions which had found that, for purposes of the First Amendment, religion does not have to encompass

---

2/ See Giannella, Religious Liberty, Nonestablishment, and Doctrinal Development, Part I, The Religious Liberty Guarantee, 80 Harv. L. Rev. 1381 (1967), for a more detailed analysis of this balancing test as applied by the courts in assessing religious liberty claims.

a belief in the existence of God. Welsh v. United States, 398 U.S. 333, 340-41 (1970); United States v. Seegar, 380 U.S. 163, 185 (1965); Torcaso v. Watkins, 367 U.S. 488, 495 (1961). Neither does an activity have to be formally connected with a recognized religious sect to be labeled religious. Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421, 430 (1962).

However, notwithstanding these expansive interpretations, religion certainly cannot be construed to envelop an educational program that attempts merely to impart basic ethical and moral values to the children of this society. On this point, the District Court in Malnak v. Yogi stated:

> "Similarly, principles which society at large finds beneficial and useful are not religious in nature merely because similar principles are common to the dogmas of many religious sects. For example, a public school could teach its students that it is wrong to steal or murder without violating the establishment clause. The public school could not teach its students to refrain from stealing because God has proscribed it. The principle is not necessarily religious, but becomes religious if taught as a divine law." 440 F.Supp. at 1316-17, n.20 3/

Consequently, the fact that an educational program teaches moral and ethical views that have their roots in the Judeo-Christian heritage would not, of itself, make such activity religious in nature. "The term 'education' includes cultivation

---

3/ This thought mirrors Justice Brennan's concurring opinion in Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203, 300 (1963), in which he explicitly states that although morning devotional exercises in the public schools are constitutionally infirm, there is nothing that forecloses teaching about the Bible or religion in the classroom. "To what extent, and at what points in the curriculum, religious materials should be cited are matters . . . to entrust very largely to the experienced officials who superintend our Nation's public schools."

of morality as well as attainment of knowledge and intellectual culture." Kaplan v. School Dist. of Philadelphia, 178 Pa. Super. Ct. 88, 90, 113 A.2d 164, 166 (1955). Indeed, one commentator has observed that moral education has always been "implicitly" taught in American schools.

> "In all schools, students are exhorted to 'be themselves', and at the same time to 'get along', a compound of individualistic and social morality. By gentle persuasion, and on occasion by overt pressure, the schools enforce conventional personal behavior, civil virtues, parental moral codes and their own professional ethics." Bereday, Values, Education and the Law, 48 Miss. L.J. 585, 587 (1977).

Consistent with this tradition, your Commission is now attempting to formulate broad guidelines for the formal teaching of values in the schools (e.g., self-esteem, a sense of duty, personal integrity, tolerance for the rights of others). This appears to be an attempt to recognize and meet head-on the fact that high juvenile crime rates, cheating epidemics in all levels of schooling, and the "Watergates" of our nation are indicia that our moral fibre needs strengthening. See, Essay Review, Moral Education Without Moral Education, 49 Harv. Educ. Rev. 240 (1979).

It follows that values education serves the legitimate secular purpose of preparing individuals to be self-reliant and self-sufficient participants in society. Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205, 211 (1972). In doing so, it does not seek to aid or inhibit any particular religion. Additionally, the teaching of values does not of itself interfere with or burden anyone's freedom of belief. This is not to say that there could not be incidental course discussions of religion or that at times certain "traditional" ethical values may not be espoused. Although there must be a complete and unequivocal separation of church and state, the First Amendment "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation. . . .Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter." Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306, 312 (1952). The state must be firmly committed to a position

of neutrality in religious matters, but it is not required to take an adversarial posture or to handicap religions. Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1, 18 (1947).

We are not unaware of the debate that has accompanied values education by parents who believe that the school curriculum should stick to the "3 R's" or that courses in values represent intrusions into the privacy of family life.4/ This controversy is not unlike that surrounding the teaching of sex education courses, and it is important to note that the courts have uniformly upheld these courses when challenged by parents as violating the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment as well as privacy rights. See, e.g. Mercer v. Michigan State Board of Education, 379 F. Supp. 580 (E.D. Mich. 1974); Cornwell v. State Board of Education, 314 F. Supp. 340 (D. Md. 1969); Citizens for Parental Rights v. San Mateo County Board of Education, 51 Cal. App. 3d 1, 124 Cal. Rptr. 68 (1975); Hopkins v. Hamden Board of Education, 29 Conn. Supp. 397, 289 A.2d 914 (1971); Medeiros v. Kiyosaki, 478 P.2d 314 (Haw. 1970).

These decisions reflect the State's "undoubted right to prescribe the curriculum for its public schools" as long as its programs neither aid nor oppose any religion. Epperson v. Arkansas, 393 U.S. 97, 107 (1968). Only when that power is abused and there are attempts to tailor learning to the principles or prohibitions of a particular religious sect or dogma will the Courts interfere. (For example, in Epperson, a criminal statute prohibiting the teaching of the Darwinian theory of evolution was struck down.) To allow parents to regulate their children's education to conform with their religious beliefs would "tend to render a well-regulated public school system vulnerable to fragmentation whenever sincere, conscientious religious conflict is claimed." Hopkins v. Hampden Board of Education, 289 A.2d at 924. Neither may the fear that a state education law might be deliberately violated by one or more school teachers or administrators warrant the decision that a values education course is unconstitutional. "The Court cannot assume that any religious activities seep into or permeate the secular purposes of the curriculum." Id. at 923.

Parents opposed to values education might allege that these courses would interfere with their parental authority to teach ethical values at home as well as their right to privacy under the First Amendment.5/ In the challenges to sex and family

---

4/ See Struck, "School Debate Heats Up Over Teaching of Values", The Sunday Sun, May 27, 1979, at A1.

5/ See, e.g., Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479, 483 (1968).

education courses, the two most often cited authorities for this position are Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) (upholding the rights of parents to have their children learn a foreign language) and Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925) (upholding the rights of parents to have their children educated in private schools). It is true that in these and related cases, the Supreme Court has recognized that "the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder." Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158, 166 (1944). But it has never been held that the rights of parents or the family itself are beyond regulation in the public interest. Parham v. J.L., 47 U.S.L.W. 4740, 4745 (U.S. June 19, 1979).

In its role as parens patriae, the State legitimately has restricted parental control through compulsory attendance laws, child labor laws, health measures such as vaccinations, and other ways.

> "[The state's] authority is not nullified merely because the parent grounds his claim to control the child's course of conduct on religion or conscience. . . . [T]he state has a wide range of power for limiting parental freedom and authority in things affecting the child's welfare; and this includes, to some extent, matters of conscience and religious conviction." Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 321 U.S. at 166-67.

Thus, an earlier challenge by Maryland taxpayers seeking to prevent the implementation of sex education courses on this very basis (i.e., that as parents they had the exclusive constitutional right to teach their children about such matters at home) was rejected by the court, which characterized the theory as a "novel proposition." Cornwell v. State Board of Education, 314 F. Supp. at 342.

In conclusion, it is our belief that values education may be included in Maryland's curriculum for its public schools without infringing on any First Amendment rights. Of course, such programs must steer a neutral course in the religious sphere and maintain the firm wall that separates our religious and secular

lives. Also, such courses must preserve the classroom as a true "market place of ideas" and avoid a "religion of secularism" or the indoctrination of one-sided views. The controversy that has arisen stems from fear of governmental intrusion into personal lives, and the Commission has a sensitive task ahead. Obviously, programs that would require disclosures relating to a student's innermost thoughts and facts relating to the personal and intimate lives of families should be avoided. "The vigilant protection of constitutional freedom is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools." Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479, 487 (1960).

Very truly yours,

Stephen H. Sachs
Attorney General

Ellen M. Heller
Assistant Attorney General

Avery Aisenstark
Principal Counsel,
Opinions and Advice

Appendix D

MARYLAND COMMISSION ON VALUES EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 1. THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

1. The State Board of Education and each of the State's local boards of education should formally review this Commission's formulation of character value goals, together with the Attorney General's opinion of July 19, 1979, and should consider adopting a statement on goals for character and citizenship education.
2. After adopting a statement on character and citizenship goals, each local board should call upon the local superintendent of schools to formulate a plan of action designed to improve the effectiveness of the schools in reaching those goals. In formulating such a plan, the superintendent should consider the recommendations of this Commission as well as such other suggestions as may be valid and appropriate and should arrange for consultation on this plan of action with parents, school staff, community service groups, and other representatives of the general public.
3. Having adopted a statement of character and citizenship goals and having received the superintendent's recommendations, local boards of education should review the superintendent's recommendations for action, should implement those recommendations which meet board approval, and should distribute copies of the statement of principles to each school principal under their jurisdiction.
4. Each school system which has not yet done so should prepare a description of the expected qualifications and tasks of a principal. Each school system which has heretofore adopted such a description should review the text to determine whether character value goals are adequately covered and, if they are not, should amend the text accordingly. Among the relevant desired qualities are the following:
   (a) The principal should demonstrate moral courage and strength and should be able to establish and maintain appropriate standards of behavior.
   (b) The principal should be a responsible individual who indicates a concern for *all* people.
   (c) The principal should be fair in dealings with all teachers, pupils, and parents.
   (d) The principal should display a sense of professional commitment by being willing to "go the extra mile," and should be sensitive to staff and pupil needs.
   (e) The principal should be approachable, friendly, and "open."
5. Guidelines for screening committees which recommend candidates for principalships should direct due attention to the local school board's expectations with regard to a principal's ability to help a school achieve the local school board's character and citizenship goals.

   As a candidate's written resume would not reveal much about that person's competence in this field, the questions asked in the interview with the screening committee should be designed to elicit comments which would shed light on the aspiring principal's ability to help a school achieve the character value goals.
6. Screening committees that recommend principals should consist of persons from varying backgrounds, including parents and persons now serving or who have previously served as principals. In providing for a screening process, local boards of education should adopt policies and procedures appropriate to the local school district, mindful of as well as guided by the opinion of the local community.
7. The State Board of Education should call upon the State Superintendent of Schools to prepare a program for the enlargement of the Maryland Professional Development Academy so as to include units dealing with the subject of the principal's role in character and citizenship education. As so enlarged, the total effort of the Maryland Professional Development Academy should be further expanded by involving a greater number of principals for a longer time period each summer. The Academy should play a major role in improving the performance of principals and enhancing their status as educational leaders in the State. All principals should be expected to participate in this effort. Because of its critical importance to the school system, the program should be called to the express attention of the Governor and the General Assembly and should receive their full support.
8. Local boards of education should review the administrative staffing pattern of the schools and should provide principals with sufficient clerical and other assistance so as to free time for the critical leadership tasks which a principal is expected to perform.
9. Principals should serve an initial probationary period. Thereafter, principals should undergo periodic, thorough re-evaluations and should remain in their positions only if their records demonstrate their continued competence to hold a position of such importance.
10. The position of principal should be significantly enhanced, both in terms of status and compensation. Generally speaking, we believe that the position of principal ought to be viewed as a position of line responsibility, requiring greater talents and, therefore, deserving of higher rank and compensation than most of the persons holding administrative positions in the central office of the local school system.
11. The State Board of Education should call upon the State Superintendent to develop, in cooperation with local school superintendents and institutions of higher education, a program to assist principals in broadening their experience and knowledge, through special seminars and such other methods as may be found appropriate.
12. Local boards of education should instruct superintendents to develop a program to upgrade the positions of vice and assistant principals and to improve inservice training for persons holding those positions.

CHAPTER 2. THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

13. The standard of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification relating to character and citizenship education should be more clearly defined so as to indicate, as it is applied in teacher training institutions in Maryland, what specific behaviors are desired and how these teacher skills are to be acquired. Accrediting agencies should be contacted by the Maryland State Board of Education to explore ways in which citizenship and values educa-

tion might be specifically incorporated in the standards thus assuring that all teacher preparation institutions give specific attention to the acquisition of the necessary skills by their student teachers. (See Appendix G for the statement of the NASDTEC Standard.)

14. The Maryland State Board of Education should approach teacher training institutions to investigate thoroughly the gap between theory and practice, i.e., how do the theories and research about value beliefs affecting student learning translate into skills pre-service teachers need to master. These institutions should also examine their own priorities to determine how seriously character and citizenship education skills are included in their teacher preparation programs and where in pre-service programs characteristics expected of teachers (e.g., competence, dedication, role modeling, and voluntary efforts) are equally to be expected of college instructors.
15. More emphasis in teacher education programs needs to be placed on having student teachers learn how to recognize, relate, and assimilate principles and concepts of character and citizenship education so that they are brought into focus in the entire curriculum. Such educational goals transcend specific aspects of individual curricula.
16. The Maryland State Board of Education should take steps to insure that student teachers have specific guidance in course selection to enable them to handle the variety of problems in discipline likely to be encountered in their teaching careers.
17. Local boards of education should institute policy which would be required to implement the previously adopted Statement of Purpose on Values Education.
18. Principals, teachers, parents, and pupils along with curriculum and staff development personnel should be involved in planning a comprehensive character and citizenship education inservice program.
19. Inservice programs should recognize that values are "taught" both consciously and unconsciously and should, therefore, be planned to reflect the character and citizenship goals enunciated in this report.
20. Inservice programs that are flexible and responsive to the needs of teachers should be planned, rather than have all teachers participate in the same inservice activities.
21. The inservice programs should generally be conducted at the local school level.
22. Though the local school might well be the major focus for inservice for values education for teachers, there are roles for other agencies and levels of education which make interagency coordination a necessity.
23. Youngsters who have serious, chronic problems of social maladjustment should be placed in an alternative school setting and offered a program and supervision which will be specially designed to assist them in the process of socialization. (Note should be taken of our Recommendations in Chapter 4 concerning action to be taken on students who have violated the law.)
24. Arrangements should be made in all schools for youngsters who are disruptive and only temporarily out of control to be separated promptly from the rest of the student body and placed under supervision until they regain their composure.
25. It must be made clear to teachers that it is their responsibility to take all appropriate steps to discourage the outbreak of disruptive behavior and to end it once it has broken out. We recognize fully that teachers cannot be expected to risk physical injury in quelling disorder. On the other hand, they must not ignore disorder whether it occurs in the classroom or in any other part of the school setting. Their responsibility, as indicated, is to take all *appropriate* steps, which might in some cases mean personal intervention and in others might mean that unruly behavior must promptly be reported to the principal.
26. Beyond that, it should be made clear to teachers that if they become aware of violations of the law or of school regulations, such violations must also be reported to the principal. Consideration should be given to the possibility of such reports being treated as confidential, if that is necessary to protect teachers against physical attack.
27. Major responsibility for good order in a school building rests ultimately with the building principal. It should be the responsibility of principals to counsel teachers on how they can most effectively act to prevent or end disruptive behavior. Teachers should not be penalized in their evaluations for their efforts to end disruptive behavior, either by intervening personally or by reporting it, as long as they act reasonably.
28. Teachers should be provided with effective inservice training on how to deal with disruptive behavior including information as to all relevant laws and regulations. In the course of such inservice training it should be explained to them that they may be sued for their actions. This is one of the professional hazards they must face. At the same time, local boards of education should make certain that such teachers do receive adequate legal protection for their reasonable acts.
29. The State Board of Education should clearly articulate and widely disseminate policy on the rights of teachers and their access to due process in cases involving threats and/or injuries caused by students.
30. Those local boards of education with vague, relatively lenient, unpublished, and/or inconsistently applied sanctions against such illegal acts as the use, possession and/or distribution of controlled substances should review and revise their policies for handling such infractions.
31. Local boards of education should seriously consider all feasible means of reducing large school populations, including possible consideration of the continued or alternative use of school buildings scheduled to be closed because of declining pupil populations. For example, where an unusually large high school population exists, consideration should be given to the possibility of sending part of the student population to a neighboring junior high school scheduled to be closed. Where school populations are larger, boards of education should consider the staffing ratio of pupils to teachers and the possibility of providing additional staff to handle difficult discipline problems more adequately.
32. We recommend that the teacher organizations make a conscious and conscientious effort in the negotiations of their contractual requests with boards of education to express positions which will truly facilitate the achievement of the goals of citizenship and character education.
33. We recommend that teachers who do not have conflicting commitments volunteer their efforts in carrying out school programs of an extracurricular nature which could be

perceived as being beyond the "call of duty." The demonstration of concern for pupil growth in such areas as after-school tutoring, counseling, coaching, club advising, provides a role model of desirable citizenship traits for students to emulate. However, in encouraging such additional performance of teachers, administrators should pay appropriate attention to the provision of satisfactory working conditions in school buildings, including heat and personal security.

34. We wish to stress that there should be extra pay for extra work.
35. There should be no provision in the negotiated agreements which infringe on the principal's right and need to direct the activities of a teacher during the normal working hours, particularly activities designed to maintain good order in the school day.
36. We recommend that local school boards and educational leaders should be alert to opportunities in the negotiation process with their teachers to enunciate policies calculated to encourage joint action toward student growth in basic character and citizenship values.

CHAPTER 3. PUPIL SERVICES GUIDANCE PROGRAMS

37. Guidance counselors shall actively promote the ten (10) character objectives and eight (8) citizenship objectives adopted by the Values Education Commission. Counselors with appropriate training shall conduct inservice courses or workshops for classroom teachers and other staff members to insure that all staff members have the skills to do likewise.
38. Every local education agency shall formulate a K-12 program for the early identification, counseling, and where appropriate, the referral of such students to outside agencies.
39. A task analysis or evaluation of a counselor's job should be performed by the Maryland State Department of Education to determine which counseling services demand the expertise of professional, trained counselors and which services can be performed by clerical staff; outside community agencies; by volunteer aides; and in some instances, by classroom teachers.
40. Every local education agency and the State Board of Education should explore all feasible means for strengthening and increasing the guidance programs offered to elementary school students.
41. Local school boards should examine various funding procedures for distribution of pupil services resources. Sufficient funds should be allocated to insure implementation of any Commission recommendations that may be adopted.

CHAPTER 4. OTHER-AGENCY COOPERATION AND DISCIPLINE AND DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR

42. We recommend that the State government establish an interagency council to coordinate all appropriate recommendations of this report between public and private community agencies and the schools.
43. The State Superintendent and the superintendent and board of education in each of the 24 school districts is requested to appoint a task force of staff members, representatives of pertinent agencies, and interested citizens in the community to examine the adequacy of cooperation between the school system and other public/private agencies that could make a contribution to the teaching of character and citizenship values. This task force would also examine discipline and disruptive behavior in the schools to make recommendations that might be helpful to the school district to:
    (a) Quantify the magnitude of these problems.
    (b) Chart long-range plans—where indicated—for activating parents, students, and community agencies to work for more acceptable levels of human conduct in the community and eliminate physical abuse, vandalism, and other symptoms of disruptive behavior in the community.
    (c) Obtain staff and other resources needed for the schools to overcome these debilitating problems, where they exist.

CHAPTER 5. PARENTS' ROLE

44. School systems should develop a Parents' Responsibilities and Rights document similar to that for students. This would help to clarify the expectations of both the home and the school. Some systems have devised a handbook of policies and a calendar of events—all systems should consider a comparable publication.
45. We recommend that a board of advisors be appointed for each public school in the State. The board should be from three to five in number, selected by the principal from citizens in the school community, serve staggered terms, and serve as an advocacy group for that particular school in matters dealing with the local board of education or parental concerns in that school community.

CHAPTER 6. CURRICULUM IMPLICATIONS

46. (a) First and foremost, schools must have strong programs in history and government, literature, and the arts.
    "The humanities are to be studied because they show what human intelligence and will have done, how they have achieved what they have—and how they have failed, and why the questions and methods involved bear on human life and aspiration. Great tradition in the humanities from Socrates to the present stress the superiority of respect for evidence and reasoned discourse over idiosyncrasy, mere opinions, or prejudice as means of seeking the truth."
    (Edwin Delattre)
    (b) Careful evaluation and selection of textbooks and library material should take place to insure that the opportunity exists for students to harvest the richness of the humanities.
    (c) Schools should pay careful attention to extracurricular programs, including athletics, as these opportunities help students to understand team work and interdependency and to develop self-esteem.
    (d) Students should learn about the world's major religions. Understanding and respect for beliefs and traditions which are central to others is an essential ingredient for healthy human relations.
    (e) Exposure to the vital moral choices before our society should be a focus of every school. These social and moral issues, such as poverty; the problem of how we

live together in a multi-ethnic, multi-racial/multi-religious society; ecology; civic responsibility; and war and peace are examples of crucial human problems which students must deal with and begin to understand.

(f) The development of local services and/or human service projects that provide students with a personal exposure to the needs and concerns of the elderly, the handicapped, the ill, the poor can provide unique opportunity for students to grow and develop into caring and mature persons. In addition, the numerous cultural resources of the community such as museums, symphonies, etc., can add enrichment to student life and should be utilized by the schools to the fullest extent possible.

(g) Effort to involve and to communicate with parents is an absolute necessity. They must know what the school's goals are and how they plan to achieve them. Parents can provide a unique kind of support and assistance to schools in the common task they share of nurturing the development of their children.

47. We call upon each of Maryland's school districts to develop its own program that will more effectively transmit to each generation the character and citizenship objectives that are so vitally needed if we are to successfully face the challenges and needs of a free democratic society.

48. (a) The Maryland Values Commission requests that each local education agency distribute copies of this report to appropriate officials, including board members, parent-teacher association presidents, and interested community groups, and schedule several meetings designed to discuss and evaluate the recommendations contained herein.

(b) Each local education agency should establish a broad based commission, including parents and community groups, designed to evaluate existing curriculum and instruction; to examine the experience of other schools or school systems more thoroughly involved in character and citizenship education; and to aid in curriculum design or revision that will result in an organized, comprehensive, and structured values education program.

(c) Once a plan is adopted, adequate inservice training programs for teachers must be developed. Such a program should be based upon the following principles:

1. Teachers must be well aware of the 18 character and citizenship traits and should feel secure enough about their importance to be willing to deal with their practical application in an explicit way.
2. Application of the character and citizenship traits should be drawn from real or realistic experiences if they are to become part of the behavior patterns of students.
3. The teacher is a role model who must respect the rights of individuals and who must establish an honest, accepting, and non-threatening atmosphere in the classroom.

(d) Implementation must be monitored by the school's administration and staff involved must be held accountable for meeting expected levels of performance.

(e) The overall effort should be periodically evaluated by local education agencies based upon established goals.

49. The State Department of Education should establish a resource center for values education and assign one or more persons the prime task of providing guidance to local education agencies (LEAs) which want and request aid in carrying out the recommendations of the Maryland Values Commission. Similarly, each LEA should develop a specialist who will be able to aid individual schools within the district.

50. Development and implementation of a program by LEAs need not and should not be delayed pending the receipt of additional resources. Most of the recommendations of this Commission are presently being dealt with in some manner. Charges in emphasis and minor shifting of resources that may be necessary should receive priority consideration.

51. We recommend that copies of the Maryland Values Education Commission's list of character and citizenship values be distributed and appropriately displayed in every classroom in the State. We recommend that this recommendation be implemented by the Governor.

MARYLAND VALUES EDUCATION COMMISSION REPORT

LEGEND:

ACTION (ACT) — Adoption, by official action, of a policy or regulation by the governing body.
COOPERATION (COOP) — Endorsement and encouragement to teachers.
IMPLEMENT (IMP) — Setting into motion procedures to carry out policy, regulations, and recommendations.
MONITOR (MON)
RECOMMENDATION (REC) — Development of proposals for Board of Education action.
SUPPORT (SUP) — Providing resources necessary for implementation.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	GOVERNOR	LEGISLATURE	STATE BOE	LOCAL BOE	STATE SUPT. OF SCHOOLS	LOCAL SUPT. OF SCHOOLS	TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS
PRINCIPALS								
1-1	Adopt character value goals			ACT	ACT	REC	REC	
1-2	Implement goals				MON			IMP
1-3	Provide support and resources to implement goals				ACT		REC	
1-4	Prepare and adopt qualifications of Principal; emphasize goals implemented				ACT		REC	
1-5	Screen Principalship candidates reability in values leadership						IMP	
1-6	Adopt Principal selection policies and procedures; emphasize values leadership				ACT		REC & IMP	
1-7	Expand Professional Development Academy	SUP	SUP	ACT		REC & IMP		
1-8	Provide adequate support staff for Principals				ACT		REC	
1-9	Evaluate Principals performance and assignment						IMP	
1-10	Upgrade qualifications, expectations and compensation of Principalship			SUP	ACT	SUP	REC & IMP	
1-11	More emphasis on Principal's training			SUP		IMP		
1-12	Upgrade qualifications and performance of Assistant Principals				SUP		IMP	
TEACHERS								
2-13	Incorporate citizenship and values education in Teacher Certification			ACT		REC		COOP
2-14	Determine adequacy teacher training reteaching values			ACT		IMP		COOP
2-15	Train teachers to integrate values education into curriculum					IMP		COOP
2-16	Train teachers to maintain discipline			ACT		REC & IMP		COOP
2-17	Implement Statement of Purpose on values education				ACT		IMP	COOP
2-18	Plan comprehensive values education inservice						IMP	
2-19	Recognize that all teachers teach values in in-service plan						IMP	COOP
2-20	Individualize inservice to teacher needs						IMP	COOP
2-21	Provide inservice at local school level						IMP	
2-22	Coordinate inservice with other agencies					IMP	IMP	
2-23	Inform teachers of due process rights						IMP	COOP
2-24	Adopt effective disciplinary procedurse for serious offenses				ACT		REC & IMP	
2-25	Reduce large school populations				ACT		REC & IMP	
2-26	Negotiate contracts that facilitate values education				ACT		REC & IMP	COOP
2-27	Teach values through extracurricula activities						IMP	

Maryland Values Education Commission Report (cont.)

	RECOMMENDATIONS	GOVERNOR	LEGISLATURE	STATE BOE	LOCAL BOE	STATE SUPT. OF SCHOOLS	LOCAL SUPT. OF SCHOOLS	TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS
Teachers (cont.)								
2-28	Extra pay for extra work				ACT		REC & IMP	
2-29	Don't limit Principals' authority in working with teachers				ACT		REC & IMP	COOP
2-30	Enunciate policy that advances values education				ACT		REC & IMP	COOP
2-31	Provide alternative schools for students who need it				ACT		REC & IMP	
2-32	Use in-school suspension as appropriate						IMP	
2-33	Don't condone disruptive behavior on school campus						IMP	
2-34	Report serious pupil violations to Principal						IMP	
2-35	Principals train teachers to handle disruptive behavior						IMP	
2-36	Provide legal protection for teachers who intervene						IMP	
COUNSELORS								
3-37	Implement character and citizenship objectives						IMP	
3-38	Early identification, counseling, referral						IMP	
3-39	Do task analysis and job description of Counselor's job					IMP		
3-40	Strengthen elementary school guidance					IMP	IMP	
3-41	Provide adequate funds for pupil services						REC & IMP	
3-42	Establish State Inter-Agency Coordinating Council	ACT	ACT					
3-43	Appoint Task Force to examine discipline and disruptive behavior				ACT		REC & IMP	
3-43	Stimulate interest in Coordinating Council and Task Force Reports				ACT		REC & IMP	
PARENTS								
3-44	Produce parents' responsibilities and rights publication						IMP	
3-45	Establish local school advisory boards				ACT		REC & IMP	
TEACH VALUES								
3-46	Values education permeates all aspects of school			ACT	ACT	REC & IMP	REC & IMP	
3-47	Values education develops out of broad, informed community support			ACT	ACT	REC & IMP	REC & IMP	
3-48	Foster wide interest in Values Commission Report			ACT	ACT	REC & IMP	REC & IMP	
3-49	State Department of Education assistance to locals					IMP	IMP	
3-50	Begin implementation with resources currently available					IMP	IMP	
3-51	Display character and citizenship goals in every classroom in State	ACT		ACT	ACT	IMP	IMP	COOP

about the author

MARY ANN KIRK is currently Executive Director of The Citizenship Education Foundation, Inc., a private non-profit organization dedicated to promoting the teaching of citizenship principles in public and private schools. She has been a resident of Maryland since 1955, where for 23 years she was a homemaker very much involved in school and volunteer activities at the local, state and national levels.

Her successful lobbying experience with the Maryland Legislature in 1978 resulted in the Governor-appointed Maryland Values Education Commission (the first of its kind in the country), the incorporation of The Center for Citizenship Education (CCE), the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship (CAC) in 1981, and The Citizenship Education Foundation in 1983. She served as Vice Chairwoman of the Commission, President of CCE, and Secretariat and Founding Executive Director of CAC.

Her work in the areas of values and citizenship education has placed her in the vanguard of a national movement. Her articles have been published in national publications such as *PTA Today, American Education, The Washington Report,* (U. S. Chamber of Commerce) as well as local newspapers *(Baltimore Sun, Montgomery Journal).*